CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.613
20 February 1992

FINAL RECORD OF THE SIX HUNDRED AND THIRTEENTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 20 February 1992, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. Mutuale Kikanke (Zaire)

GE.92-60398/4261B

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The 613th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament is called to order.

Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, first of all, I have the pleasure, on behalf of the Conference and on my own behalf, to welcome most warmly the Vice-Chancellor and Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs of Germany, His Excellency Mr. Hans-Dietrich Genscher, who is our first speaker today.

I should like to express to His Excellency, the Vice-Chancellor, our gratitude for the interest with which he follows our work. Since 3 February 1983, he has visited us repeatedly to present the views of his Government on vital disarmament issues and, in particular, to invite us to step up negotiations for the complete prohibition of chemical weapons. I should also like to thank His Excellency, the Vice-Chancellor, for having kindly agreed to address the Conference at a turning-point, when negotiations on these weapons, we all hope, are to lead to a convention this year. I am convinced that the contribution of Germany will be decisive in achieving this goal. The commitment and effectiveness shown by the German delegation in its chairmanship of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons also are proof of the importance of Germany's participation in the negotiating process in the Conference.

On the occasion of Zaire's accession to the presidency of the Conference, I should like, with your permission, Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, to make a brief opening statement.

First of all, I should like to thank my predecessor, Ambassador Calovski of Yugoslavia, for the exemplary fashion in which he presided over our work at the beginning of our annual session. He performed a particularly difficult task with tact and with vast experience as a diplomat, which we all appreciate. He was able to settle many organizational issues, such as requests for participation from 40 non-member States and the re-establishment of four Ad Hoc Committees of the Conference, as well as an appropriate organizational framework for consideration of agenda items 2 and 3. Special coordinators have also been appointed on agenda items 1 and 8. For my part, I should note that I shall continue the consultations conducted by my predecessor on other pending issues before the Conference.

We are now in the last decade of this millenium. We are travelling on a planet which is suffering profound upheavals, unexpected challenges, the weakening of values and established concepts that previously seemed inviolable or untouchable. We live in a world of turbulence and of numerous perplexities and, in several areas, mankind is confronted with completely new options which call for restructuring, require reorientation and demand new attitudes on the part of both large and small Powers - a new "fresh" look, a keen awareness of the community of our interests and a broad sense of our common destiny.

From this standpoint, disarmament constitututes, in the realm of international relations, one of those privileged areas of awareness of this fellowship and of the sense of our belonging to a single great human family. What nation today can claim that it is safe in the event of the use of the monstrous weapons that human intelligence has invented and turned into such a

(The President)

flourishing industry? The notion of individual security must vanish and crumble before the compelling reality of collective security. That is why disarmament should not be considered as a choice, an option. In our view, it should be perceived as an unavoidable necessity for the survival of the whole human family, and of its environment.

Mankind has behind it a long, a very long, experience of war, and war, wherever it takes place and whatever its scale, is always and invariably a failure, a source of suffering, destruction and tension whether covert or overt, concealed or latent.

It is one of the lessons of modern times that the excessive ill-considered accumulation of weapons constitutes paradoxically a threat to the very security that it claims to afford.

Naturally, each State has a legitimate right to maintain enough armaments on its territory for it self-defence, but anything over and above that necessity, beyond that level, is over-armament.

The development of weapons increases insecurity, and the existence of an over-armed world represents a permanent situation of danger, a permanent potential threat to stability and peace; it represents a permanent temptation to the strongest to use their arms. Consequently, it makes peace fragile, it makes security uncertain. In short, in no way does it make the slightest contribution to the consolidation of peace and stability among peoples and among nations.

The international community is thus justified in expecting a great deal from this Conference. No effort should be spared to limit, and regulate the production and export of the latest arms and equipment, whatever they may be - nuclear or conventional, chemical or bacteriological, radiological or space weapons. It is fortunate that the Conference has now reached the stage of negotiations on a multilateral convention on chemical weapons.

Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, allow me to briefly recall a dimension of the disarmament problem, which, in my view, is not often sufficiently highlighted. It is the link, the almost natural link between disarmament, on the one hand, and the general obligation to settle disputes by peaceful means, on the other. The more this standard of conduct enters into the behaviour of Governments, the more willing States will be to have recourse to the mechanisms and procedures contemplated in the Charter of the United Nations and the less often will they resort to armed conflict or war. Any approach to the disarmament issue which does not take account or sufficiently stress this aspect could lead to very illusory results. How could it be otherwise, when we cannot really conceive of a world without conflicts, without clashes, without disputes, and when it is imperative that a solution be found to each conflict, to each clash and to each dispute?

In short, it is a matter of substituting peaceful settlement for the use of weapons. This is why the more importance the international community attaches to the obligation to settle disputes by peaceful means, the more it will serve the cause of disarmament.

(The President)

Ladies and gentlemen, I shall conclude by thanking you in advance for the help that I hope to receive from each and every one of you. I hope to conduct the negotiations on outstanding problems with the support and invaluable cooperation of all coordinators, of the Chairmen of the Ad Hoc Committees, and of the secretariat of the Conference. One of our most fervent wishes is that this year a multilateral convention on chemical weapons will be completed. Such an achievement would serve as an important catalyst for our future.

On my list of speakers for today I have the distinguished representatives of Germany, Argentina and Australia.

It is with pleasure that I now give the floor to the Vice-Chancellor and Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs of Germany, His Excellency, Hans-Dietrich Genscher.

Mr. GENSCHER (Germany) (translated from German): Mr. President, allow me first of all to congratulate you on assuming the presidency of the Geneva Conference on Disarmament. I wish you every success in carrying out this responsible task, which, I am convinced, is in good hands.

My vist today occurs during the initial phase of a very important annual session of the Geneva Conference on Disarmament. In the next few months we must successfully conclude decade-long efforts to arrive at a global ban on a category of the most horrific weapons of mass destruction. This year we must succeed in finalizing a convention banning chemical weapons. That is an historic responsibility for the member States that here prepare new disarmament and arms control agreements on behalf of the international community.

Since my last visit to Geneva, in September 1990, for the Fourth NPT Review Conference, the situation in Europe and throughout the world has changed dramatically. In this changed situation, all of us have the chance to write a new chapter of arms control and disarmament history.

In nuclear disarmament new, epoch-making developments have been launched in the only one and a half years since the Fourth NPT Review Conference. In fulfilment of the obligation deriving from article 6 of the NPT, the United States and the former Soviet Union concluded far-reaching agreements. In the Summer of 1991, the START Treaty was signed. It will considerably reduce the strategic arsenals of the United States and the former Soviet Union. Its comprehensive verification regime will lead to intensive cooperation on security policy, cooperation which will have a confidence-building effect beyond the area directly concerned. President Bush and President Yeltsin have announced further drastic reductions in their strategic nuclear arsenals. United States Secretary of State Baker and Russian Foreign Minister Kosyrev have reaffirmed in Moscow their determination to achieve that major goal.

(Mr. Genscher, Germany)

Tactical nuclear weapons - i.e. short-range nuclear missiles and nuclear artillery - must, in accordance with the declarations of President Bush and former Soviet President Gorbachev, be eliminated without delay. These weapons have long been an anachronism, and Germany is particularly keen to see them eliminated.

We consider it necessary to achieve, at long last, a negotiating mandate for a test ban agreement. An agreement banning nuclear explosions for test purposes must be concluded at the earliest possible moment.

Germany itself has for decades renounced the manufacture and possession of, and access to, nuclear, biological and chemical weapons. But we know that real success can be achieved only through cooperative action by all States, since all of them are jointly concerned. The aim must be to safeguard and strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation regime, whose central pillar is the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

We are gratified to note that a number of States acceded to the Treaty last year. We welcome the announced accession of France and China. I call upon all States that have not yet done so to accede to the Treaty without delay. I am also greatly gratified that most of the Soviet Union's successor States have already announced their intention to do so.

In 1995, a decision is to be taken on the extension period for the NPT. Germany decidedly advocates unlimited extension.

The danger of a spread of nuclear weapons is among the most burning security issues of our time. That danger must be met more effectively than in the past. It is now nearly one minute to 12. Under no circumstances must the number of possessors increase. The Non-Proliferation Treaty makes no provision for sanctions, however. For its application it needs a patron. That role must be assumed by the Security Council, which has the authority to impose sanctions and the instruments to enforce them.

States which, contrary to international law, try to acquire the capability of producing nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction should be the target of the most stringent possible sanctions. Only the complete isolation of such States can deter them from activities threatening world peace and the existence of the human race. The Security Council should see this as one of the focal points of its future work.

Germany acted resolutely and responsibly in the achievement and implementation of Security Council resolution 687, which opened a new perspective for an enhanced role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament and arms control.

Mr. President, the central task of the Conference on Disarmament this year is the conclusion of a convention on a global, reliably verifiable ban on chemical weapons. The CD States have set themselves the goal of completing this task at the current session.

(Mr. Genscher, Germany)

Your appointment of Ambassador von Wagner to the chairmanship of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons during this decisive year is an expression of your confidence in Germany's commitment to these negotiations, and I thank you for it. Germany takes this responsibility very seriously and we will do all in our power to bring the negotiations to a punctual and successful conclusion.

Chemical weapons are a man-made scourge of humanity. As I have repeatedly said at this Conference, they are not weapons at all but means of exterminating people.

The ban on the use of chemical weapons has been disregarded time and again and has proved inadequate. Even unilateral measures, however urgent these might be, can only temporarily stem the tide of proliferation. Only the clear-cut prohibition of any association with chemical weapons, hence including production, acquisition and possession, can finally free us of this scourge of humanity.

The convention prohibiting chemical weapons can only do this if two preconditions are met: first, accession to it by the vast majority of the international community, and, secondly, confidence in the effective verification of the prohibitions agreed on.

The first precondition for a successful convention is accession by as extensive a membership as possible. For that, the advantages of the Convention must be judged as outweighing its cost. For some States which do not see their neighbours as a threat, the gain in security may seem small. But no one should forget how deadly the combination of missile technology and mass-destruction weapons can be. No State is immune to that threat.

Now let me say something about the second aspect, verification. Only verifiability of the obligations assumed creates confidence, and only confidence creates security.

The negotiations on the verification system of a chemical weapons convention are far advanced, and everything points to possible consensus. The reliably verifiable proscription by the international community of a whole category of weapons of mass destruction will be a pioneering achievement.

Controls of the chemical industry are indispensable for a chemical weapons convention. The task of the convention is to deter, by means inclusive of verification measures, any attempt to misuse the civilian chemical industry for the production of chemical weapons. Naturally, such verification measures, being so new, cannot function perfectly from the outset. The task of the future Chemical Weapons Organization and its technical secretariat will be to gradually develop verification procedures that work to the satisfaction of all member States.

The international community must make it part of its code of conduct to accord a State that accedes to this convention greater confidence and willingness to cooperate than a State that does not.

(Mr. Genscher, Germany)

Confidence will also be generated by the destruction of the existing arsenals of chemical weapons, which have long been a burden even to their owners.

I welcome President Yeltsin's statement that Russia has taken over responsibility for the destruction of all of the formerly Soviet stockpiles of chemical weapons. Special importance attaches to the timely destruction of those stockpiles. Russia needs help in dealing with problems arising in connection with the storage, security and destruction of those weapons. Germany is ready to help but others must also do so.

The banning of weapons of mass destruction must also include biological weapons. We welcome the results of the Third Review Conference, in September 1991, of the Parties to the Biological Weapons Convention. It is a further contribution to the development of the system of confidence-building measures. That convention should be equipped with a verification system.

The disintegration of the Soviet Union has given a new dimension to the already existing peril of the spread of know-how concerning the manufacture of weapons of mass destruction. On this I submitted proposals to Secretary-General Boutros-Ghali. Those ideas were taken up and reaffirmed in the Final Declaration of the Security Council Summit of 31 January. Along with United States Secretary of State Baker and Russian Foreign Minister Kosyrev, I called for the establishment of an international science and technology centre in Russia. Scientists previously employed in research and development on weapons of mass destruction are to be given civilian jobs in their own country. The idea is to minimize any temptation to engage in activities that would lead to the proliferation of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons, as well as of delivery technologies. Through projects in their own country these scientists and engineers are to participate in the reduction and elimination of weapons of mass destruction and to contribute to greater safety in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. This initiative is in many respects an important contribution to conversion. To be successful, the initiative will require considerable international support. It already has the backing of the European Community.

The Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe creates an indispensable basis for a new cooperative security system in Europe, a basis for further deep cuts in excessive weaponry and for overcoming the old thinking in terms of a power struggle. Germany will make every effort to ensure that that Treaty enters into force and is implemented by all its States parties and their successors as soon as possible.

It is also necessary for the ongoing CFE 1 a negotiations to supplement, with an agreement that limits personnel levels, the CFE Treaty, which establishes ceilings only for the principal conventional weapons systems. Germany has set a good example with its 1990 commitment to limit our forces to 370,000 men. We expect the other negotiating parties to follow that example.

(Mr. Genscher, Germany)

We also expect the forthcoming CSCE follow-up meeting at Helsinki to chart the main points on the road to a new cooperative security system covering the vast area from Vancouver to Vladivostok. The ending of the Cold War and the new common order of values for human rights, democracy and the rule of law, established in the Charter of Paris, offer an historic opportunity for this.

This urgently requires additional radical disarmament and arms control measures, but also a broad-based open dialogue on all aspects of security, and lastly the strengthening of stability in Europe through effective conflict prevention and crisis management. Here, Mr. President, you have rightly pointed out the close connections between disarmament, conflict prevention and crisis management. Success here is in the interests of the CSCE States and in the interests of the whole world. The Helsinki meeting is also to see the signing of an "Open Skies" agreement which will make military transparency and thus confidence building throughout the CSCE area a reality for the first time. Willingness to accept comprehensive transparency, inspection and verification must be a major element of cooperative security and confidence building.

An example of this in the field of chemical weapons are challenge inspections throughout the territory of the contracting States. They are an extreme means of checking compliance with the chemical weapons convention. Outside Europe, the opening of sensitive facilities to such inspections is still largely unknown, but our experience in this area has been good. I can tell you, Mr. President, that today Germany is probably the most inspected country in the world, and this has in no way impaired our security. On the contrary, it has won us more confidence.

It is the attitude to transparency, the willingness to accept inspection and verification that is the touchstone which separates two approaches, which separates old thinking from new thinking. To wish to keep everything secret is old thinking. Complete openness is a manifestion of new thinking. Those who have nothing to hide need not fear openness. They can rather prove the good intentions that stand behind their words. Thus, this new openness becomes an essential element of confidence building. As we know, distrust is one of the causes of tensions, and tensions are the causes of the arms races that follow.

Mr. President, today no State, no region in the world, can shirk its active responsibility for international security any longer. I welcome the fact that the United Nations General Assembly has decided on a register for conventional weapons. It is a measure I have been advocating in the United Nations for almost 12 years. The CSCE States have undertaken to provide comprehensive information for the register. We expect all the other United Nations Member States that endorsed the General Assembly's decision to likewise publish their data on exports and imports of conventional weapons in the register. In addition, further relevant information should follow, with a view to developing a comprehensive system of transparency in military matters, as a globally applicable United Nations confidence-building measure. The Geneva Conference on Disarmament can assume a significant role in the necessary preparations.

(Mr. Genscher, Germany)

The next step must be effective measures to limit and monitor exports of arms. Now that, with the ending of the Cold War, Europe has prepared the way for stopping the export of that political dynamite to the Third World, it must henceforth refrain from exporting its now superfluous arms to the Third World. It is intolerable for the North to stuff the South of this Earth with weapons it no longer needs. Disarmament must therefore be supplemented by conversion. The conversion of military production facilities into facilities for producing peaceful goods must be made a priority for international-stability policy. For that, we need a conversion of technological know-how as well as a conversion of arms factories.

Mr. President, if the mandate of the United Nations General Assembly that a chemical weapons convention be submitted at this year's session is to be implemented, consensus must be reached by the beginning of August. The progress already made and the spirit in which you are supporting the German chairman make me confident that this goal can be reached.

Thereafter, when this year's United Nations General Assembly has endorsed our common product, a signature conference should be convened as soon as possible. I call upon all States that have not already done so to declare their willingness to become original signatories of the convention. To obtain the signatures of as many States as possible under this historic document from the outset, all members of the international community, whether members of the Conference on Disarmament or not, should participate in such a signature conference. I welcome President Mitterrand's offer to hold such a conference in Paris before the end of the year.

For the Geneva Conference on Disarmament, the chemical weapons convention will be the first treaty to be successfully concluded since the Biological Weapons Convention of 1972. In that sense, the success of the CW Convention will also guarantee continued confidence in the Geneva Conference on Disarmament and in the fulfilment of its future tasks. Germany will do all within its power to contribute to a successful outcome. Of that, Mr. President, I can expressly assure you and the States assembled here.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank His Excellency, the Vice-Chancellor and Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs of Germany, for his important statement and for the kind words he addressed to me.

I now give the floor to the distinguished representative of Argentina, Ambassador García Moritán, who will speak on behalf of the delegations of Argentina and Brazil.

Mr. GARCIA MORITAN (Argentina) (translated from Spanish): Mr. President, I should like to express my delegation's satisfaction at seeing you in the Chair, presiding over the sole forum for multilateral negotiations on disarmament, and to stress again as regards efforts to strengthen international security - the very special relationship which links our two countries in the framework of the South Atlantic zone of peace and cooperation. Our personal friendship and the professional respect I have for you accentuate the confidence of my delegation in your presidency. You can count on the cooperation of the Argentine delegation in this new responsibility.

(Mr. García Moritán, Argentina)

I should also like to avail myself of the opportunity to express our thanks to our colleague and friend, the Ambassador of Yugoslavia, for the work he did for the Conference on Disarmament during the first month of the current session. To him and his efficient delegation we extend our gratitude.

It is my privilege to be the first speaker after the Conference on Disarmament listened to the statement of the Vice-Chancellor and Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs of Germany, Mr. Hans-Dietrich Genscher, in the Salle du Conseil this morning on the occasion of his delegation's chairmanship of the final phase of our negotiations on chemical weapons. It is a further clear testimony of the unique responsibility that the Conference on Disarmament is exercising today and of the urgency and importance of its tasks.

It gives me particular satisfaction to be taking the floor this morning on behalf of the delegations of Brazil and Argentina, thus continuing to present our coordination in matters of disarmament and security policy, whose latest contribution was reported to this body by my friend the Ambassador of Brazil, Mr. Celso Amorim, when he introduced a few weeks ago our bilateral agreements on the exclusively peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

On the same question I should like to add on behalf of Ambassador Amorim and myself that, on instructions from Brasilia and Buenos Aires, we shall be submitting as an official document of the Conference on Disarmament the recent message sent by the Presidents of our two countries to OPENAL (Organization for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America) on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

In that joint statement, the President of the Federative Republic of Brazil and the President of the Argentine Republic refer inter alia to the fact that they are in the process of "taking effective measures for the implementation of the third and last commitment of the Declaration of Foz do Igaçú" and they go on to indicate that "at the earliest possible opportunity we shall submit for the consideration of OPENAL some amendments to the text of the Treaty of Tlatelolco of a primarily technical nature not affecting its principles and purposes in any way".

Mr. President, besides announcing the submission of that important document, today Brazil and Argentina would like to express some general considerations on a category of weapons of mass destruction of particular significance and responsibility for all of us in this Conference on Disarmament: chemical weapons.

Time flies and we are faced with the fact that we are now well into the first quarter of 1992. This is the year within which we have committed ourselves before the international community to conclude our negotiations. That commitment, which is a prominent feature of the mandate we have given the Ad Hoc Committee, has caught the attention of the international community, which is carefully watching us.

(Mr. García Moritán, Argentina)

A few weeks ago, as a tangible reflection of the rapid and promising changes that have occurred in international politics in so short a time, the 15 Heads of State or Government of the member countries of the Security Council gathered in New York for a summit meeting, the first since the signing of the San Francisco Charter almost half a century ago.

On that occasion, the permanent and non-permanent members of the Security Council issued a joint statement which has the merit of being a coherent and consensual review of some of the most urgent problems on the international agenda, among them the problem of chemical weapons. The then President of the Security Council, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, read out the joint statement on behalf of the members of the body that, according to the Charter, "bears primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security". The statement expressed support for our negotiating efforts to conclude, by the end of 1992, a universal convention - including a verification regime - to definitively prohibit chemical weapons.

The hackneyed phrase to the effect that we can no longer behave as if the situation were one of business as usual seems finally to have acquired real meaning.

Time is short, but I believe that we have all the necessary elements to finish the convention now. To begin with, we consider the Ad Hoc Committee chairmanship of Ambassador von Wagner in itself an element that must be recorded as important for achieving so difficult objective in so brief a time. Allow me, Mr. President, through you to address our colleague Ambassador von Wagner, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, in order to reiterate to him the commitment and unlimited cooperation of the delegations of Brazil and Argentina in taking the final step in our negotiations. Our task, Ambassador von Wagner, cannot be more demanding and its urgency has been recognized by all. However, in saying that the task is urgent, we do not wish to imply that it must be completed hastily. Nevertheless, while fully conscious of the heavy responsibility borne by the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee, we are also aware that after almost a decade of negotiations all of the elements are on the table and the time has come for the final political decision.

In our view, it is time to assemble the factors of the final equation, to put them in logical order and to submit them to the plenipotentiaries for definitive consideration. The idea, with respect to certain questions, of "leaving them to ripen" - a euphemism which has served to circumvent the absence of political will in the past - will no longer do.

Universal participation is a principle dear to the political and diplomatic tradition of Argentina and Brazil, and consequently we fully support it in this area while recognizing the logical limitations sometimes imposed by political reality. In this regard, we shall continue our endeavours to win more support, every day, every minute, in an effort of diplomatic education to make obvious to all what is already a conviction to most of us here, i.e. that accession to this convention will be good not only for the international community but also, and above all, for everyone in our States individually.

(Mr. García Moritán, Argentina)

In any case, in our subcontinent, South America, the States - through pronouncements like the Mendoza Agreement, the official text of which is now before the distinguished delegations, which comprises Brazil, Argentina and Chile and to which the Eastern Republic of Uruguay, Paraguay and Bolivia will accede, as well as the Declaration of Cartagena of the Indies, uniting the efforts of Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia and Venezuela - have sent a strong and unanimous political signal of support for the convention through the commitment of our countries to be original signatories of the convention.

To the above must be added the public expressions of many other countries in other continents and regions along similar lines, all of which allows us to conclude that we have already reached the critical mass necessary to launch the first multilateral convention prohibiting completely and without discrimination an entire category of weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. President, as we proceed to this final phase of the negotiations, allow me to share with you briefly some ideas which Brazil and Argentina consider relevant and which are currently being dealt with in the Ad Hoc Committee.

First, as regards the verification regime. In our opinion, it would be advisable to deal with realistic assumptions. The scheme of inspections will necessarily have to adjust to the realities of a budget which will inevitably be limited. Consequently, we must ask ourselves whether it would be sensible to aim at a scheme requiring a very large number of inspections if that target cannot be met. We would be running the risk of unleashing a gigantic system which would not provide the degree of security proportional to the resources that would be at its disposal.

The system of routine inspections should, in our judgement, be guided by clear cost-effective criteria. At the same time, as is the case in other, similar situations, the inspections would have to be made primarily by the Organization, including such aspects as the designation of relevant facilities and the execution of the inspections themselves.

As regards such questions as national designations in connection with inspections of the chemical industry, the principle could be reflected in the convention in such a way as not to weaken the powers and the role of the Technical Secretariat vis-á-vis the views of the States parties, which could be taken into consideration as suggestions. On that understanding and with those limitations it should not prove very difficult even now to arrive at compromise formulas.

As to another aspect of challenge inspections, Brazil and Argentina would perhaps have preferred to see a model of challenge inspections closer to the original version (anytime, anywhere and without right of refusal) than the one we are finally considering.

The approach suggested in the proposal of the United States, the United Kingdom, Japan and Australia departs considerably from that scheme, probably owing to the new reading its authors have given to the post-cold war

(Mr. García Moritán, Argentina)

global strategic scenario. We believe that if, as negotiators, we have to accept this new scheme for the sake of consensus, it would be useful to strengthen those special aspects which, if not adequately addressed, might weaken the system to the point of irrelevance.

We are referring specifically to questions like securing the inspection site, minimum intervals once inspection is requested, and other elements connected with managed access. There has also been discussion about the question of observers, an integral part of the United States proposal, and about whether it belongs in a convention of this kind. We believe that it should prove possible to agree on a mechanism allowing the presence of observers in consultations with the requested State. Nevertheless, it must be spelled out clearly that it is the team of international inspectors of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons that carries out the inspection in all its aspects. To call into question their impartiality and their technical expertise through the presence of onlookers would create a dangerous precedent which could have repercussions even for the normal functioning of other mechanisms of internationally applied safeguards, such as the case of nuclear safeguards.

The third aspect we should like to deal with this morning is the role of the Executive Council in challenge inspections.

Closely connected with the system of challenge inspections is the question of assigning a role to the Executive Council in the process, both at its beginning - to determine the appropriateness of the request - and at the end of the inspection - to indicate whether or not there has been a violation. The question is extremely complex and the development of the negotiations will no doubt alter or nuance the nature of the controversy.

Be that as it may, we deem it important to keep a basic premise. The Executive Council is a political organ, albeit tinged in this case with major technical elements. That being so, it would be extremely dangerous to try to transform it into a judicial body, able to grant or not to grant a request that might have been submitted for inspection, or to pronounce final judgement concerning the situation that gave rise to the inspection. The Executive Council of the Organization will issue neither good-conduct certificates nor guilty verdicts. That is not its function and it would be unrealistic to claim that it is.

It would be possible, on the other hand, to accept the inclusion of a minimum of provisions whereby the Executive Council could have a rapid preliminary supporting opinion from the Technical Secretariat concerning the request for inspection. That organ should limit itself to confirming the existence of sufficient elements to justify launching the complicated and costly process of a challenge inspection, without entering into a value judgement on those elements, something that would seem a priori unrealistic coming from an office situated far from the place concerned. Otherwise, the Council would become a scene of polemics inconducive to the ultimate purpose of the Convention.

(Mr. García Moritán, Argentina)

As to granting the Council the power to pronounce on the final results of the inspection, we believe that the caution called for in the previous case is even more necessary here. It should be borne in mind at all times that a challenge inspection might well produce ambiguous results or lend itself to different readings. It could even happen that the results of an inspection may be considered valid at a certain time but not necessarily applicable to future situations. As we see, the range of possibilities is too great to be thinking about endowing the Council with the power to pass final judgement on circumstances which may well be ambiguous or not very clear. But all of the above is without prejudice, of course, to the full exercise by the Council of the important political powers set out in the text of the convention.

Mr. President, one of the aspects on which Brazil and Argentina have laid particular emphasis is the subject of economic and technological development and international cooperation, and in that context the matter of controls or limitations on international trade in chemicals and related equipment.

Our insistence simply reflects a concern which Argentina and Brazil have expressed and will continue to express in all fora and bodies that deal with questions relating to security. It is based simply on the idea that States which have given the international community satisfactory guarantees regarding their commitments with respect to the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction should not encounter limitations on their legitimate aspirations to develop and accede to dual-use technologies for the development and welfare of their peoples.

With reference to this topic I would like to draw attention to the ideas expressed some days ago in this room by Ambassador Errera of France when he indicated his readiness and that of his Government to seek, by way of open dialogue, a solution to the complex problem of the technology-cooperation-security triad. In our convention, these questions fall within the scope of article XI.

We are hopeful that the efforts of the friend of the Chairman responsible for this important question, Counsellor José Eduardo Felicio of Brazil - whom I would like, as head of the Argentine delegation, to assure of our complete support and confidence - will be matched by the necessary search for compromise on the part of all delegations, in particular those which, in the absence of a multilateral convention, have so far chosen the path of restrictions channelled through informal groups.

Linked to that problem is the problem of cooperation and trade relations between parties to the convention and States which opt to remain outside of it. We believe that with a little imagination it would be possible to design a gradual scheme that would avoid extremes and allow for trade under clearly defined conditions and requirements similar to those in the nuclear field where the existence of models of safeguards agreements on a case-by-case basis has produced an adapted and flexible response that perhaps could be followed in the chemical convention.

(Mr. García Moritán, Argentina)

I deem it important to stress that what we have in mind is not a scheme that would threaten the universality of the convention or indirectly discourage the decision of States to accede to it but, on the contrary, a strict regime of a temporary nature that would cater for the concrete situations that are bound to arise in the first years after the entry into force of the convention.

One of the effects of having negotiated this convention for so long is that, like a historical saga, it has been incorporating elements coming from earlier negotiating traditions and conditions.

That would be an interesting tale if our task were to recount the history of our negotiations, but it sometimes becomes an unnecessary obstacle when our object is to complete the treaty once and for all. Much has been achieved in 1991 in attuning our convention to the signs of the times we are living. The finishing touches are still to be made, however, and in them perhaps a little boldness may not be superfluous.

We are counting on the boldness of all the delegations here and of the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee, and we, for our part, promise that of Brazil and Argentina in order to attain the lofty objective we have set ourselves, which is to complete, in the next few weeks, a convention definitively banning chemical weapons.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the representative of Argentina for his statement on behalf of the delegations of his country and Brazil, and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of Australia, Ambassador O'Sullivan.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN (Australia): Mr. President, may I commence by congratulating you on the assumption of the leadership of our Conference and assure you of the full support of my delegation? May I also take the occasion to thank Ambassador Calovski and the hard-working delegation of Yugoslavia who helped us through the difficult early weeks of this year?

Mr. President, I should like to commence by applauding the statement that we have heard this morning from the Vice-Chancellor and Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs of Germany, in particular, his injunctions to us to conclude a Chemical Weapons Convention this year. I also wish to say that I fully share the sentiments that have just been expressed by Ambassador García Moritán of Argentina. In particular, I strongly support his view that we need a new sense of urgency, a new approach to our work, some audacity, some boldness and we need to take final political decisions here.

Mr. President, in June 1988, the Australian Prime Minister announced that Australia was in the process of initiating a Regional Initiative on Chemical Weapons Issues in South-East Asia and the South Pacific, with the objective of developing a greater regional understanding of the future Chemical Weapons Convention and its requirements for national implementation.

(Mr. O'Sullivan, Australia)

As we have previously stated in this forum, as part of this Regional Initiative, Australia has hosted two seminars, one in Canberra in August 1989 and one in Brisbane in November 1990.

I spoke to this Conference on 14 February 1991 and said that Australia intended to host a workshop for regional chemists later in 1991, with the aim of providing the necessary background to those technical advisers in governments in the region who may be required to assist in the national implementation of the future Convention.

It is my pleasure to report that this workshop was held, as planned, last August, at the Materials Research Laboratory with 19 participants from 16 countries in our region. In addition to the presentations and discussions on the scientific and technical aspects of the CWC, the participants observed the conduct of a Trial Inspection of a chemical plant site that may be defined as either Schedule 3 or "CW-Capable" under the future Convention. A Trial Inspection report is being issued by the Secretariat as document CD/1128, and will appear as Working Paper CD/CW/WP.385. I hope that this Working Paper will assist in the future work of this Conference and the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, in particular, the Working Group on Verification.

Mr. President, while discussing the subject of implementation of the future Convention, a number of delegates at this morning's meeting may recall that at the Government-Industry Conference against Chemical Weapons, held in Canberra in September 1989, the Australian Foreign Minister announced that the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade was proceeding to establish a National Secretariat to act as a nucleus for the future Natonal Authority of the CWC. The Minister stated that that secretariat, in consultation with appropriate Federal and State Government departments, would be responsible for reviewing existing laws and regulations covering the activities of the Australian chemical industry, and looking for ways to introduce and adapt the prospective requirements of the CWC to our current regulatory matrix.

The first task of the National Secretariat was to develop a strategy to prepare Australia for national implementation of the Convention. The strategy comprises a programme of consultation and research leading to the development of a package of implementation measures which will be considered by the Australian Government at the appropriate time. A document entitled "Strategy for Preparing for the Implementation of the Chemical Weapons Convention in Australia" was presented to the Conference on Disarmament in February 1991 as document CD/1055. That paper served to illustrate the fact that there is a wide range of tasks which should be initiated in good time by all governments to allow arrangements to be put in place for a smooth transfer from signature of the Convention to its ratification.

An important requirement under the future Convention, highlighted in the Strategy Paper, is the assembling of data on which chemicals are produced, used, and traded. When considering its approach to implementation, Australia's National Secretariat was faced with the problem of not knowing the levels of production or use of the relevant chemicals in Australia. This is a

(Mr. O'Sullivan, Australia)

fundamental question which is critical for any country in determining not only the size and shape of its National Authority, but also the overall national implementation effort which will be required.

With this in mind, the National Secretariat has recently commenced a survey to collect the information about the production, processing and consumption of chemicals that would be required from Australia by the Organization when the Convention comes into effect.

The survey questionnaire was developed by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, with the technical assistance of the Materials Research Laboratory, chemical industry organizations, and a number of chemical companies. The survey was conducted in December 1991.

Mr. President, it is my pleasure to report that document CD/1129 (Working Paper CD/CW/WP.386) which is being issued by the Secretariat, discusses the overall objectives and the approach taken in the conduct of the survey. In addition, a copy of the survey questionnaire is included as an annex to the working paper. It is our hope that this working paper, and in particular the survey methodology and questionnaire, will assist other countries in undertaking similar exercises in preparation for the implementation of the CWC.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the representative of Australia for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to me.

I have no other speakers on my list for today. Is there any other member of the Conference who wishes to speak at this stage? There is none.

We will now consider a request from Panama to participate in our work. The Secretariat has circulated the relevant draft decision in document CD/WP.424, which contains a note by the President. As no objection was raised when the communication from Panama was circulated, I suggest that we should now adopt the draft decision directly in plenary. May I take it that the Conference adopts document CD/WP.424?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I am pleased to inform you that the informal consultations regarding the chairmen of the subsidiary bodies have been successfully concluded. Before turning to nominations for the chairmen of the Ad Hoc Committees under agenda items 5, 6 and 7, I should like, as President of the Conference, to point out that the decisions which we are about to take will apply only to this annual session and will not constitute a precedent for the future work of the Conference.

I now propose to the Conference the nomination of Ambassador Romulus Neagu of Romania as Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space. May I take it that the Conference adopts this proposal?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I now give the floor to the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Ambassador Nasseri.

Mr. NASSERI (Islamic Republic of Iran): Mr. President, may I congratulate you first and express our fullest satisfaction in seeing you in the position of leading our Conference? Knowing your experience and background, I am sure they will contribute to the best way of handling our work and let me assure you of my delegation's fullest cooperation.

I should like to make the following statement on behalf of the Group of 21 in connection with the re-establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space.

On 6 December 1991, the United Nations General Assembly by an overwhelming majority and only one dissenting vote adopted resolution 46/33 on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space. The resolution reaffirmed cardinal principles that we would like to reiterate this morning, such as the common interest of mankind in the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes and the need to take further measures, including the negotiation of appropriate international agreements, in order to prevent an arms race in outer space.

In this respect, the primary reponsibility of the Conference on Disarmament as the single multilateral negotiating body has been once again emphasized.

The resolution further requests the Conference on Disarmament to intensify its consideration of the question of the prevention of an arms race in outer space in all its aspects, building upon areas of convergence and taking into account relevant proposals and initiatives. In this regard, special mention was made to relevant proposals and initiatives, including those presented in the Ad Hoc Committee at the 1991 session.

The Group of 21 believes that the work of the Ad Hoc Committee in 1991 made important progress towards a more systematic consideration of the issues covered by its mandate and programme of work. The preliminary work done by the friends of the Chairman on salient aspects of the space and security agenda was unanimously recognized by the Committee, which recommended that the exercise be continued in 1992. We thus consider that there exists a sound basis for the continuation of the efforts which, based upon previous work carried out by the Committee since 1985, acquired in 1991 a more focused character.

To achieve this, the Group of 21 remains convinced that a negotiating mandate would be necessary, as it would help in concentrating our efforts on concrete proposals aimed at preventing an arms race in outer space. To the regret of the Group, however, this has not been possible due to the reluctance of some delegations to accept such a change.

(Mr. Nasseri, Islamic Republic of Iran)

In order to facilitate the speedy resumption of work, the Group of 21 has decided to go along with the same mandate as before. This is a renewed demonstration of the flexibility and goodwill of the Group. It is our hope that other delegations will respond constructively to this attitude and agree to a more focused approach to relevant issues so that we can move forward in areas where there are prospects for agreement.

Given the urgency the Group of 21 attaches to this item, it is of the view that substantive work should start immediately in order to achieve progress and attain positive results. We continue to expect substantial movement on the issue of the mandate in the near future.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran for his statement and for his kind words to me.

I now turn to nominations for the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on Effective International Arrangements to Assure Non-nuclear-weapon States against the Use or Threat of Use of Nuclear Weapons, and propose Ambassador Nasseri, of the Islamic Republic of Iran, for that office. May I take it that the Conference adopts this proposal?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I should now like to turn to nominations for Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on Radiological Weapons. I propose Ambassador Serguei Batsanov, of the Russian Federation. May I take it that the Conference so decides?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I should like to extend to the chairmen of the subsidiary bodies whom we have just elected our congratulations and best wishes for success in discharging their important responsibilities.

I am told that the representative of Chile has asked for the floor.

Mr. GONZALEZ (Chile) (translated from Spanish): Mr. President, my delegation would first like to associate itself, in particular, with the congratulations extended to you and assure you of its support in the work of the Conference on Disarmament, to which my country attaches the greatest importance.

We did not intend to take the floor at this plenary meeting. However, Mr. President, we are prompted to do so by the important statement made by the Ambassador of Iran on behalf of the Group of 21, in order to reiterate our well-known position on the question of the military uses of outer space and on the consequent need for the Ad Hoc Committee on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space to play a negotiating role. In this regard, we should like to recall and emphasize the excellent work done in the past year by the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee, Ambassador García Moritán of Argentina, which enabled

(Mr. Gonzalez, Chile)

us to move forward in a minimum process of identification in order to establish a frame of reference for the adoption of more specific legislation on a matter of particular concern to us.

However, we should also like to recall, Mr. President, that many years ago in the United Nations General Assembly, we, in conjunction with the delegation of Mexico among others, pressed for the inclusion of an item on the militarization of outer space, a proposal which was adopted by a large majority in the General Assembly and which also gave a form of mandate to the Committee on Outer Space to reach a decision on this question. That was in 1983, Mr. President. Almost 10 years have passed and we have consistently been told that the Committee on Outer Space, the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, has no capacity, mandate or opportunity to decide on this question, inter alia, because it is for the Ad Hoc Committee on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space, which is a body of the Conference on Disarmament, to do so. However, we wish simply to note and draw attention to the paradoxical fact that that Committee has thus far not been given a negotiating mandate either.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): With regard to the re-establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban, the special coordinator, Ambassador Shah of India, has actively continued his consultations and I hope that we shall have some good news soon. The other matter that we must consider was taken up by the General Assembly in its resolution 46/36 L, entitled "Transparency in armaments". I propose to continue the consultations begun by my predecessor on the proposals presented in order to better respond to the General Assembly's request. We shall hold an informal consultation, open to all members of the Conference, at 10 a.m. on Tuesday, 25 February, in this conference room, with interpretation services.

As you know, in the Thursday plenaries, we normally adopt the timetable for the following week's meetings. However, as we have just taken decisions regarding the chairmen of the Ad Hoc Committees, I thought it preferable not to have the timetable circulated before consulting the newly-elected chairmen regarding the needs of their subsidiary bodies. When we have agreed on a programme of work, I shall ask the Secretariat to circulate the weekly timetable.

As we have completed today's agenda, I shall now adjourn this plenary meeting.

The next plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament will take place on Thursday, 27 February, at 10 a.m. sharp. The meeting is adjourned.

The meeting rose at 11.40 a.m.

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.614
27 February 1992

ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE SIX HUNDRED AND FOURTEENTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 27 February 1992, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. Mutuale Kikanke (Zaire)

GE.92-60462/4305B

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I declare open the 614th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

On behalf of the Conference and on my own behalf, I am happy to wish a warm welcome to His Excellency Andrzej Kostarczyk, the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Poland, who has expressed the wish to address the Conference today. The Under-Secretary of State, who is particularly experienced in the field of international law and is a member of parliament, has been a member of Solidarity since its establishment. In 1990, he founded the Political Council of the Centre Alliance Party, and in 1991 he was appointed to the Committee of Presidential Advisers. Mr. Andrzej Kostarczyk has occupied the post of Under-Secretary of State since July 1991.

On the list of speakers for today are the representatives of Poland, Hungary, Chile, Canada and China. I now have pleasure in giving the floor to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Poland, His Excellency Andrzej Kostarczyk.

Mr. KOSTARCZYK (Poland): Mr. President, may I first of all express my deep thanks for your kind words of welcome? I would like to extend to you my warmest congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of this Conference, and I wish you every success in the discharge of your responsibilities. You may rest assured of our full cooperation and support in this regard. Permit me to extend my compliments to the Secretary-General of the Conference and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Ambassador Komatina, to whom, I have been informed, we shall bid farewell today. My delegation has always very highly appreciated his great professionalism, and the able and calm manner with which he assisted the work of the Conference. For the last several years, he has made a contribution of exceptional value to this body and we are sincerely grateful to him. May I also express our gratitude to Ambassador Berasategui for his great contribution to the smooth functioning of this forum?

It is a great honour for me to address this distinguished forum, the single multilateral disarmament negotiating body. Taken together with its predecessor bodies, the Conference on Disarmament stands out not only by virtue of its record of achievement and disarmament expertise but also for the fact that it is a body which has been meeting at the Palais des Nations for almost three decades now.

Dating back to the bipolar world of the early 1960s, the Conference survived the confrontation of the cold war, witnessed the demise of the Warsaw Treaty and saw the disintegration of the former Soviet Union. From a world dominated by the arms race, it has emerged into a new strategic and political environment where the exigencies of ideologically motivated politics have given way to the rule of international law and concern for well-being, security, justice and democracy for all. With the threat of a global nuclear conflict receding in the wake of such important disarmament agreements as INF, CFE and START, international security is being increasingly predicated on

(Mr. Kostarczyk, Poland)

international solidarity and cooperation aimed at responding more effectively to any threats that could endanger the achievement of a new international order. These threats are nowadays as much political, economic, social and environmental in nature as they are military.

While in the light of the foregoing it would be short-sighted to claim that disarmament efforts are less imperative these days than before, there is some merit in comments made in the course of the general debate at the forty-sixth session of the United Nations General Assembly that armaments have ceased to be the principal point of reference in inter-State relations. If the basic correctness of this premise is accepted, the Conference on Disarmament will have to draw inevitable conclusions with implications for its agenda.

Negotiations on the convention on chemical weapons have entered a final and decisive stage. The determination expressed unanimously in General Assembly resolution 46/45 C clearly indicates that the completion of work on the convention this year is within the reach of the Conference on Disarmament. In this connection, I would like to take this opportunity to express our satisfaction at the appointment of the distinguished Permanent Representative of Germany, Ambassador Adolf Ritter von Wagner, to the chairmanship of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons. I wish him all the best in discharging his demanding duties and offer him the full cooperation of the Polish delegation in this task.

There is a good basis for optimism. Indeed, the Conference has before it only a few of the outstanding issues that require final decisions. Among them, the most important ones concern the challenge inspection regime, the pattern of routine verification in the chemical industry and the composition of the executive council. Challenge inspection is essential for the effectiveness of the verification regime of the convention. In order to be acceptable to all States it should encompass a proper balance between the requirement to ensure its high efficiency and the need to protect sensitive and confidential information that is not related to chemical weapons. Requesting a challenge inspection should be the responsibility of the requesting State. It would be unrealistic, and even detrimental to the efficiency of such an inspection, to envisage any role for the organization in the assessment of the request in the initial phase, apart, perhaps, from making a technical assessment that all the necessary elements are contained in the request in accordance with the established procedures.

Poland welcomes the emerging consensus on the need to expand the scope of inspections in the chemical industry. Broad coverage of relevant peaceful chemical industry activities constitutes an important confidence-building measure. We are also pleased with the positive attitude of the representatives of chemical industry towards the convention and their recognition of its role in facilitating trade and cooperation in this field. It augurs well for achieving agreement on this issue.

(Mr. Kostarczyk, Poland)

The Conference cannot delay its decision on the composition of the executive council. Positions of States in this regard as well as on criteria to be applied are already well identified. Early agreement on the composition of the executive council and related matters will greatly facilitate the work of the Conference on other, more substantive issues.

I should also like to mention one additional issue to which my Government attaches particular importance, namely, the question of old or abandoned chemical weapons. Our position in this regard is clear - responsibility for the destruction of such weapons lies with the abandoning State.

As is well known, Poland - like many other members of the Conference on Disarmament - has already put on record its willingness to become an original signatory of the convention. We trust that in the interest of the effectiveness and universality of the future convention, all members of the Conference will be in this group.

We also believe that the Conference on Disarmament will submit to the forthcoming forty-seventh session of the General Assembly an agreed final draft of a convention on chemical weapons for its endorsement and subsequent signature. In this connection, I wish to express to the delegation of France our appreciation for the offer, made by President François Mitterrand at the recent Security Council "summit meeting" in New York, to hold in Paris, before the year's end, a special conference to sign the convention.

The question of the continued integrity and effectiveness of the nuclear non-proliferation regime has always figured prominently among the top concerns of the international community. As the Persian Gulf conflict has borne out, the concern was well founded. The mortal threat inherent in a possible erosion of the regime has perceptibly grown in the wake of the disintegration of the former Soviet Union and the ensuing confusion over who exactly does, or does not, control the vast nuclear armoury and the associated scientific and technological expertise of the former USSR. It is quite natural for the international community, therefore, to urge the members of the Commonwealth of Independent States which possess nuclear weapons on their territory to forswear them and accede forthwith to the NPT - the mainstay of the non-proliferation regime. The consolidation of this regime is very much at the heart of the concerns of the members of the international community. Indeed, it was with great satisfaction that they welcomed the recent accession of France and China to that instrument. They also applauded the addition of the Republic of South Africa and three other African States to the list of States parties to the Treaty. These welcome developments - in our view - reflect a mounting tide of support for the NPT and for the need for its universalization. Poland hopes that this important instrument will be declared of unlimited duration by the 1995 NPT Review Conference.

The Conference on Disarmament also has a standing obligation to deal effectively with the question of a nuclear test ban - which constitutes part and parcel of the non-proliferation regime.

(Mr. Kostarczyk, Poland)

Among the issues which the General Assembly has invited this body to address is the question of practical measures related to the transfer of high technology with military applications. We would like to see this matter included in the agenda of the Conference. In this connection, Poland welcomed with keen interest the concept - referred to at the Security Council "summit" meeting on 31 January last - of an international science and technology centre in Russia, in order to stem the possible dissemination of know-how in the field of weapons of mass destruction and the related delivery technology.

Poland attaches major importance to the question of openness and transparency in armaments, including international arms transfers. We fully share the rationale behind General Assembly resolution 46/36 L that it is necessary to examine the international aspects of the excessive and destabilizing accumulation of arms, including military holdings and procurement through national production.

The experience which Europe has gathered in the practical application of the CSCE principles and the structuring of cooperative security on the continent is eloquent proof that openness in military matters is a confidence- and security-building measure whose relevance may well go beyond one single region. We believe - in particular - that if put into effect and consistently applied on a sustained basis, a conventional arms transfer register, under the auspices of the United Nations, could become the kernel of a world-wide confidence- and security-building measure. We strongly believe that the Conference on Disarmament must have a role to play in the consideration and development of this measure, as it has been invited by the General Assembly to do. Poland, which for quite some time now has participated in the standardized reporting system on military expenditures, is prepared to join constructively in any efforts which the Conference on Disarmament resolves to undertake in that regard.

The Conference on Disarmament must find its proper role in the changing international environment. To live up to new expectations, a new and imaginative approach is also needed to issues concerning the improved and effective functioning of the Conference on Disarmament.

To conclude, I would like to wish the Conference on Disarmament every success in its efforts, particularly the successful completion of the chemical weapons convention. Such a result would greatly contribute to the credibility of this body. It would - above all - demonstrate its ability to use the possibilities opened up by the profound politcal changes sweeping Europe and the world at large.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank His Excellency the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Poland very much for his important statement, and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of Hungary, Ambassador Tóth.

Mr. TOTH (Hungary): Mr. President, let me at the very beginning of my statement express our heartfelt welcome to you on your accession to the high post of President of the Conference on Disarmament. We are convinced that

(Mr. Tóth, Hungary)

your well-known diplomatic abilities will guide our endeavours aimed at resolving the still outstanding problems to a successful end. Let me also extend our congratulations to your predecessors, Ambassador Horacio Arteaga of Venezuela and Ambassador Naste Calovski of Yugoslavia, whose highly professional contributions paved the way for finding mutually acceptable answers to many organizational and substantial difficulties. I would like to welcome in our midst the distinguished Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Poland, Mr. Andrzej Kostarczyk. The representatives of the respective groups will bid farewell later today in a more formal manner to our Secretary-General, Ambassador Komatina. Let me also, however, take this opportunity to extend to Ambassador Komatina our deepest appreciation for all his work in the CD and wish him well and success in his future activities.

The new negotiating mandate agreed on last summer and confirmed in January puts additional responsibility on delegations taking part in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons of the Conference on Disarmament. The ambitious but by no means unrealistic target to conclude the chemical weapons convention by 1992 requires further serious efforts on the part of the negotiators and an enhanced spirit of compromise. National positions need to be reviewed, however difficult that may be, if we are sincere about our intentions of achieving a chemical weapons ban.

The very welcome concluding phase of the multilateral negotiations on the comprehensive and global prohibition of chemical weapons appears to be no less difficult than the previous negotiating stages. Resolving a number of crucial problems that have been deferred over the years due to their contentious nature demands prompt decisions based on compromise. It is clear for us that such bold steps are not easy to take, but they are simply inevitable if we are to succeed. The mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons adopted by consensus leaves no room whatsoever for delaying concerted action on issues as yet unresolved.

We may need further initiatives aimed at speeding up the course of negotiations. All of us have to be aware of the fact that we don't have much time. This is why the approach of the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons to the outstanding issues enjoys our full agreement and support.

As Hungary has already outlined several times, our basic goal is to have an effective convention that lives up to the high requirements set by the complexity of the problems. As a humble contribution to this aim, allow me to draw your attention to document CD/1135. In this document Hungary is presenting its third annual declaration on the activities of its chemical industry as required by the draft provisions of the chemical weapons convention. The presentation is fully in line with Hungary's unilateral commitment put forward in 1989 at the United Nations General Assembly, declaring that Hungary was ready to comply with all the provisions of the convention under negotiation and to act in full conformity with it at this stage already. We firmly believe in the confidence-building effects of such

(Mr. Tóth, Hungary)

measures. Let me welcome at this point the approach of document CD/1129, submitted by Australia at our last plenary meeting, which seems to share the main purpose of our paper.

Having introduced our annual declaration, let me touch on a few unresolved points on the agenda of the CW negotiations. In our view challenge inspection is an indispensable element of any disarmament agreement. This is even more valid in the case of the chemical weapons convention, where both the relative easiness of producing dangerous chemicals and the enormous range of relevant chemical industry render the establishment of a foolproof verification system practically impossible. Earlier in my statement I had the opportunity to recall one part of the 1989 Hungarian initiative. Our unilateral commitments, however, went much further than that and also included the vital issue of verification. In fact, already three years ago Hungary stated its readiness to receive - on a reciprocal basis - verification, including on-site inspections in accordance with the objectives of a chemical weapons ban. In practical terms, this step means that any country ready to accept the same obligations vis-à-vis Hungary is welcome to carry out inspections on Hungarian soil. It stems from this unilateral measure that for us the preferred solution of the question of challenge inspections is the most stringent regime which is still acceptable for other negotiating partners. We had no serious difficulties with the so-called "classical" approach, but we also realize that national interests concerning the protection of sensitive information not directly related to the convention need to be reconciled with the objectives of the chemical weapons ban. This flexible approach, however, doesn't stand without its limits. Narrowing down conceptual differences regarding the role of the executive council, the obligations and rights of the inspected State, the question of observers, the perceived danger of abuse and the modalities for action following the preparation of the inspection report must not lead to a total dilution of the challenge regime. If the original aim of finding satisfactory answers to serious compliance concerns is lost from sight, the very sense of challenge inspections will be endangered.

It is clear that besides the technical complications associated with challenge inspections, this method of verification is overburdened by political implications. One of the highly political issues is the role of the executive council in the process of a challenge inspection. We strongly believe that a challenge inspection request needs prompt action, especially if it is to detect a suspected violation of the convention. Regular and protracted intervention by the executive council in the required automaticity in responding to an inspection request will certainly cause delays that might adversely affect the inspection procedure. Noting the justifiable concerns with regard to possible abuse or requests that clearly fall outside the scope of the convention, the setting up of an exceptional decision-making mechanism at the very beginning of the challenge process is within the limits of acceptability. This mechanism has to be quick and effective, and the possibility of stopping the inspection procedure should be linked to the consent of all members of the executive council which have no direct interest in the specific case. It seems to be undesirable, however, to set up a political filter at the beginning of the challenge inspection process. In our judgement, it is after the mission of the inspection team has been

(Mr. Tóth, Hungary)

accomplished that the executive council will have an important role to play. It is at that time that the executive council, capitalizing on all the trust that the community of States parties has in its members, will exercise its authority by reviewing the situation, considering the possible need for further action and proposing specific measures to redress the situation.

Let me also say a few words on the issue of observers. Hungary, stemming from its openness, has no problem whatsoever with accepting observers accompanying an inspection team. We believe that whenever the presence of an observer may increase the possibility of clarifying a compliance concern, his or her participation is desirable for the achievement of the basic purposes of the convention. A possible violation is not only the concern of the requesting State, but of all States parties. Yet we also witnessed that the obligatory acceptance of observers caused problems for some delegations. Our belief is that the agreement reached at the consultations held by the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee, Ambassador von Wagner, resolves the issue in a sensible manner, and we certainly endorse it.

As for the other element of the verification regime, Hungary shares the view that the system related to verifying the civilian chemical industry elaborated over the years does not really serve the underlying objectives. This is why we also welcomed new approaches aiming to integrate the major and relevant part of the international chemical industry in a more comprehensive system of verification. Unfortunately, after significant efforts to reflect these ideas in our negotiating work, we cannot yet speak of major achievements. The horizontal extension of verification activities in the chemical industry is causing problems for certain negotiating parties. If these concerns persist, we will eventually have to put up with a verification system that is neither cost-effective nor "purpose"-effective. In view of these apparent shortcomings, we will be faced again with a political decision whether the risk inherent in such an inadequate regime applicable to the chemical industry is within the confines of acceptability.

Finding the way out requires an answer to the basic question: what can we achieve through a routine verification system? If the aim is to set a regime which involves at least some elements of credibility, excluding the major part of relevant chemical industry from the scope of actual inspections simply doesn't make sense. A foolproof system is certainly no more than wishful thinking, but the rational distribution of limited financial, material and human resources must be a realistic goal. The idea of including facilities producing schedule 3 chemicals in the inspection regime is one that merits positive consideration. Such an extension of the scope of routine inspections would increase or even multiply the number of potentially inspected facilities in all corners of the world. But it is a simple fact that nearly all of these facilities are capable of producing large quantities of schedule 2 chemicals, and under the present "rolling text" this capability is simply left to the good intentions of the declaring State party. Of course, the actual functioning of any disarmament agreement is not possible without a degree of

(Mr. Tóth, Hungary)

confidence in the system and in other States parties; still, we are of the opinion that confidence must be the result of verification and not the alternative to it.

The inspection of facilities producing schedule 3 chemicals could also be a step forward in a related field, namely the problem of schedules and guidelines. We are impressed by the efforts of the technical experts to find an optimum solution, though some of the argumentation concerning the placement of certain chemicals seems to be a bit too pragmatic. It certainly appears to cause fewer practical problems to put in schedule 2 chemicals of which the annual production is only a few tons, rather than others whose annual production can only be measured in thousands of tons. Nevertheless, the only criterion to govern putting a specific chemical in schedule 2 or 3 should be the degree of danger it poses to the basic goals of the convention. One can easily come to the conclusion that the real risk lies in higher rather than lower quantities of production. If, however, all facilities producing schedule 2 or schedule 3 chemicals face in one way or other the possibility of being inspected - and why not go back here to the idea of an ad hoc basis? - the risk is at least decreased.

The ability to disclose potential non-compliance is only one element of credible deterrence. The other factor is constituted by sanctions - sanctions against those States which do not abide by their voluntarily assumed international obligations. Hungary is ready to support the strictest possible regime of sanctions against violators of this convention. In this regard, special consideration should be given to cases of the use of chemical weapons, since this is practically the only form of violation which can be proved with almost total certainty.

Speaking about sanctions, obligations and verification, one cannot avoid the problem of universality and - in close connection to it - the still outstanding issues of article XI. Our endeavours to find a solution perhaps require a twofold approach. On the one hand, States remaining outside the convention should be urged to join. It is justified by the security interests of the whole international community that, after a reasonable period of time, the ways and means of persuasion should not only be political but economic as well. The convention should include carefully worded but concrete provisions guiding our future activities in this field. On the other hand, all States have to see clearly and be able to judge their situation even before signing the convention. This requires a sharp picture of both their obligations and their rights stemming from the convention. The balance of rights and obligations is perhaps the most important ingredient of universality. A situation where States parties, with all their political, financial and other obligations, were practically negatively discriminated against compared to some of the non-parties, would seem to be going against the requirement of reasonableness. In this field, we think that the approach outlined by the distinguished Ambassador of France in his 13 February plenary statement is a very positive one and merits further exploration.

(Mr. Tóth, Hungary)

In almost every negotiating process of diplomacy a point is reached, somewhere in the finishing stage, where the potential financial implications for the contracting parties have to be addressed. We are happy to note that the chemical weapons negotiations have reached this phase, since it indicates that we are approaching the conclusion of our work. The implementation of the convention will entail two major types of costs for States parties. One is strictly national, like for example the establishing and maintaining of the national authority. Other expenses are related to the functioning of the organization to be set up under the convention. The various and extremely important functions to be performed by the organization will require substantial funds. The precise amount of these funds is as yet unknown to us, though some estimates have already been made. Whatever the sum may be, an adequate, equitable method for distributing costs has to be defined. We share the view that a single and simple formula based on the well-established United Nations scale of assessment would provide a workable solution to the problem of cost-sharing. The principles and characteristics of that formula are well known and are basically not disputed. In this way, it could provide a ready system for the sharing of costs to be borne by all future States parties.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the representative of Hungary for his statement and his kind words addressed to the Chair. I now call on the representative of Chile, Mr. Romero.

Mr. ROMERO (Chile) (translated from Spanish): My delegation has asked for the floor again to inform the plenary of the Conference of Disarmament of the content of an official statement made by the acting Foreign Minister of Chile on 12 February last on the subject of disarmament. This statement has been circulated as an official document of the Conference on Disarmament with the number 1134 and contains the views of my country on two important issues for this mulitlateral forum: nuclear non-proliferation and chemical weapons. It reads as follows:

"I should like to announce some important advances in matters of international disarmament, a question to which the Government of Chile attaches the greatest importance.

"First, I wish to refer to the announcement of the President of France, François Mitterrand, at the United Nations Security Council Summit on 31 January last, concerning the ratification by his country of Additional Protocol I to the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (better known as the Treaty of Tlatelolco). We welcome that decision as a significant move towards the desired goal of the entry into force of that treaty.

"When this French initiative is added to the Safeguards Agreement recently concluded by Argentina and Brazil with the International Atomic Energy Agency at Vienna, and to the favourable statements of the Government of Cuba regarding its ratification of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, there is now justified hope that by the twenty-fifth anniversary of its signature in 1992, this instrument may begin to have effective validity.

(Mr. Romero, Chile)

"Pursuant to the permanent instructions of President Aylwin, the Ministry is taking the necessary diplomatic actions for the early consideration in OPANAL, which is the technical body established by the Treaty for such purposes, of the legal and technical procedures for strengthening and updating Tlatelolco and bringing it into force. In preparing such actions, this Ministry will coordinate with the national technical body concerned, the Chilean Nuclear Energy Commission.

"I should also like to mention as an interesting development in the international field the signature on 30 January last of a safeguards agreement between the Democratic Peoples Republic of Korea and the Agency of Vienna which will enable IAEA to carry out the appropriate inspections of the installations and fissionable materials in that country. We have reason to hope that that agreement will be ratified and that, together with the agreement on reconciliation of the two Koreas, it will help to create a climate of security, peace and stability in that part of the world. I must point out that Chile supported the initiative of Australia, Canada and Japan urging the Government of North Korea to enter into this safeguards agreement and that our Ambassador to IAEA, as Chairman of the Group of 77 in Vienna, made important efforts to bring about consensus on the matter. This process taking place in a region of Asia adds to the explicit statements in favour of non-proliferation made by the States belonging to the new Commonwealth of Independent States and so considerably strengthens the global scope of international security.

"Another important dimension is that relating to the multilateral convention on chemical weapons which is being negotiated in the Geneva Conference on Disarmament and which unquestionably represents the most important international effort in the matter of disarmament and a significant contribution to the protection of the global environment. In that connection, it will be recalled that Foreign Minister Silva Cimma, along with his colleagues from Argentina and Brazil, signed the Mendoza Agreement, subsequently joined by the other Latin American States before and during the Presidential Summit of the Rio Group at Cartagena. At present, we are finalizing with Argentina and Brazil the contribution which the three countries can make to the procedures of verification and implementation of the future convention in keeping with the position taken in the Mendoza Agreement.

"Santiago, 12 February 1992."

The above-mentioned declaration is complemented by the letter sent by President Patricio Aylwin to the President of Mexico, Mr. Carlos Salinas de Gortari, relating to the twenty-fifth anniversary of the signature of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, on 14 February last, which I shall also read in full.

"Sir,

"Today we commemorate a quarter of a century since the date of the historic signature of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, the first example of an instrument which aspired to

(Mr. Romero, Chile)

de-nuclearize one of the most extensive, populated and strategic regions of the world. This treaty, a veritable model for all subsequent endeavours in the field of disarmament and de-nuclearization, is permanent and of indefinite duration, it possesses a body for review and verification and a system for the settlement of disputes, and it enjoys a system of safeguards on the part of the nuclear States.

"Since we both formulated in a joint declaration our appeal to all States concerned to implement the Treaty of Tlatelolco, encouraging progress has been made towards this goal: the safeguards agreement signed by Argentina and Brazil with the International Atomic Energy Agency, the announcement by France that it will ratify Protocol I, automatically making French Guiana, Martinique and Guadeloupe de-nuclearized territories, and Cuba within OPANAL, to the effect that it will also join the Treaty.

"In these promising circumstances, Chile wishes to renew its vocation to work for peace and its firm resolve to contribute to the implementation of the Treaty of Tlatelolco throughout its geographical zone of application. To this end, my country promises its broadest cooperation and hopes that the meeting of OPANAL now beginning will represent the culmination of efforts to turn the Treaty of Tlatelolco into the most efficient tool for de-nuclearization, non-proliferation and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy among member States.

"Accept, Sir, the assurances of my highest consideration.

"Patricio Aylwin Azocar
"President of Chile".

To conclude, I should like to inform the Conference that recently Chile notified the French depositary of the withdrawal of its reservations to the Geneva Protocol of 1925.

Mr. SHANNON (Canada): My principal purpose in speaking today is to draw to the attention of the Conference a number of papers which the Canadian delegation has either recently circulated to members and participants through the secretariat or is tabling today. In all, there are five such documents, some pertaining directly to our work and others of a broader scope and interest.

Since this is the first time that my delegation will be speaking at this session, Mr. President, let me first assure you of our full cooperation and express our confidence that under your chairmanship, this Conference will move forward expeditiously to tackle the many important issues the world community has put before it. Let me also take this opportunity to pay tribute to the wise and skilful chairmanship of your predecessor, Ambassador Calovski, who led us through the difficult opening weeks of organizational work. And may I also pay tribute to the Secretary-General, whose work I first recognized in

(Mr. Shannon, Canada)

Belgrade many years ago and who is a friend and who has provided me with a lot of advice and helpful knowledge about the work of this Conference, so I regret his departure.

Now may I turn to the documents we have requested be circulated? First, there is our traditional annual compendium relating to the past year's work on the CWC. This is in three volumes, one covering the procès-verbal and two covering the working papers. It is being distributed as a formal CD document. I should express my hope that this will be the last set of such documents relating to the CWC negotiations that Canada will produce. We are now in the final phase of this long-drawn-out task, and such changes to the "rolling text" as may be developed during this 1992 CD session will in the end be incorporated in the CW convention itself. And even if, contrary to all our shared hopes and expectations, we do not manage to finish our task during this CD session, we presumably will be close enough to that goal no longer to require the sort of detailed record in easily accessable form of our ongoing and past work which these annual compendiums comprise.

Also being distributed as a formal CD document is a new Bibliography on Arms Control Verification 1961-1991, published by our Verification Research Unit in October of 1991. This was done partially in response to United Nations General Assembly resolution 45/65, which adopted the report of the Group of Experts on the role of the United Nations in verification and which, inter alia, recommended that the United Nations establish a consolidated data bank of published materials. The bibliography, while not proporting to be exhaustive, contains more than 1,500 entries and attempts to cover publications and submissions from Governments and international organizations as well as literature emanating from the research community. One of our aims in producing it was to aid government officials, diplomats and researchers in their work on arms control and disarmament.

Now, let me turn to the publication Verification to the Year 2000. As a result of the momentous events of the last few years, world leaders have, correctly, declared the cold war to be over. Many also believe that we are on the verge of a "new world order", which will be characterized by increased multilateral cooperation in the security field, including on arms control and disarmament matters. While acknowledging these recent, extraordinarily positive, changes in international relations, it is important to appreciate their boundaries. It would be erroneous in our view to see the end of the cold war as also the end of concerns about security or the necessity of negotiating and concluding meaningful agreements to control and reduce armaments. Canada believes that there will be a continuing requirement to pursue such agreements not only bilaterally and regionally, but also multilaterally, including within this forum, especially if we should in due course be able to agree on updating our agenda.

As long as arms control and disarmament agreements are important, and this seems likely to be true for the foreseeable future, it is essential that they be effectively verified. It is on this subject of the ongoing relevance of verification in the new world order that I would like to address a few

(Mr. Shannon, Canada)

comments. Canada continues to believe that in the words endorsed unanimously by the United Nations General Assembly a year and a half ago, "adequate and effective verification is an essential element of arms limitation and disarmament agreements". This is equally true today as it was in the past: the need for verification is not an East-West issue that died with the cold war. "Trust but verify" is not just a slogan but a reality that still has relevance multilaterally. It is a process that can have a dramatic and positive effect on the building of confidence among nations. A recent study conducted by a group of governmental experts for the United Nations Secretary-General underscored this theme. It defined verification succinctly as "a process which establishes whether the States parties are complying with their obligations under an agreement". As long as countries rely even partially for their security on the compliance of others with respect to arms control agreements, there will be a requirement for verification. Indeed, as forces come down in size, practical security requirements such as verification do not go away. Reliable verification may well become even more important because the impact of cheating in small amounts will be more significant than in the days of massive forces.

Within the new international framework which is now emerging it should be recognized that verification need be neither adversarial nor confrontational. Indeed, one of the more positive aspects of the new world order is the increased emphasis being given to multilateral cooperation, including on verification matters. The world is in the process of truly historic changes. We are fortunate that these events are characterized by a new-found willingness by many countries to cooperate on security-related matters and to reduce and control armaments. It is fervently to be hoped that this ethos will continue, but we cannot be certain of this. Now, when the political will towards multilateral cooperation is strong, is the time to build structures and institutions that can help assuage tensions should they rise again. Arms control and disarmament verification provides one way to accomplish this. If appropriate verification procedures are in place, compliance can be clarified and military capabilities made more evident. In an ideal environment, adequate and effective verification can help build and maintain confidence between nations; in the worst environment, it can facilitate the taking of such steps as may be necessary to protect national security when non-compliance becomes evident. It is with these thoughts as background that I would like to draw the attention of this body to the document entitled Verification to the Year 2000. This document had its genesis in the realization that the dramatic changes in the world would have significant effects on the verification of arms control and disarmament agreements. As a result, a research project was undertaken to explore the new requirements, challenges and opportunities likely to face the verification process in the 1990s. Four distinguished scholars of diverse backgrounds - two Americans and two Canadians - were invited to come together and focus on the following tasks: first, to identify trends with respect to the verification of arms control and disarmament agreements (including confidence-building), both bilateral and multilateral; second, to outline how these trends may be expected to evolve to the year 2000; and third, to suggest profitable areas for future research in this field. This report is the

(Mr. Shannon, Canada)

culmination of their efforts. It represents an innovative, insightful and rigorous attempt to examine developments over the next decade with respect to both bilateral and multilateral verification. We commend it to your attention.

We have asked the secretariat to distribute to all of your delegations informally two other publications which we expect may also prove of interest to you. One of these, entitled Verifying Limitations on Military Personnel, is the ninth in our series of Arms Control Verification Occasional Papers. One of the authors is Alex Morrison, whom those of you who have been attending the First Committee over the years will recall was for some time our Military Adviser to our Permanent Mission in New York. The other of these papers, which should be of more general interest, is entitled Towards Helsinki 1992: Arms Control in Europe and the Verification Process. It comprises the proceedings of the Eighth Ottawa Verification Symposium, which took place in our capital almost a year ago. We expect to be able to arrange for its distribution in the near future. That is all I have to say for the present, though I look forward to addressing our concerns and interests pertaining to the substantive elements on our agenda in due course. In the meantime we hope that the documentation which we are making available will be both useful and of real interest.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the representative of Canada for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair. I now call on the representative of China, Mr. Hu Xiaodi.

During the past 12 months a lot of work has been done in the negotiations on a chemical weapons convention. Among the progress achieved we have been able to start our preliminary but detailed discussions on the issue of challenge inspection, taking the four-State proposal as a basis. Substantive consultations have also started on the issue of the executive council, among

(Mr. Hu, China)

others. The new "rolling text" itself indicates the enormity of the work. However, if we are to achieve the goal of concluding the convention within this year, much difficult work remains to be done and a number of major issues have yet to be resolved - for instance, challenge inspection, verification of the civilian chemical industry, the executive council, abandoned chemical weapons, article XI of the convention, and so on. China has always maintained a positive position towards the chemical weapons convention and its negotiation, and the Chinese delegation hopes that fair and reasonable solutions can be found to all these issues so as to successfully realize the goal of completing the chemical weapons convention before the end of the year.

The fundamental purpose and objective of the future chemical weapons convention lie in the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of all chemical weapons. To this end all States should undertake corresponding commitments, including the obligation to destroy the chemical weapons each has abandoned on the territory of another State. A just and thorough solution of the issue of chemical weapons abandoned by a foreign State is one of the most urgent tasks in the negotiations on the chemical weapons convention. And the purpose of my statement today is to introduce documents CD/1127 and CD/1130 tabled by the Chinese delegation upon instructions on the issue of abandoned chemical weapons. These two documents also bear the symbols CD/CW/WP.384 and CD/CW/WP.387.

First of all, in response to requests and proposals made by some delegations, the Chinese delegation is now providing, in the form of a CD document as well as a working paper of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, information on chemical weapons abandoned in China by a foreign State, with a view to promoting understanding and facilitating the work of the Conference and its Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons.

As is known to all, the Chinese people have in the past been victims of the use of chemical weapons by a foreign State, and even to this date such weapons are still causing tremendous losses and constitute a grave threat. After nearly half a century, such weapons continue to be discovered in China. They have done great harm to the safety of the Chinese people and their property and ecology. As the foreign State concerned has provided no information on the chemical weapons it abandoned in China, it is impossible to take the necessary precautionary measures when such weapons are discovered, and many injuries have occurred as a result. Preliminary statistics reveal that direct victims alone have numbered more than 2,000. Furthermore, the danger posed by such abandoned chemical weapons to the natural environment and to the safety of human beings is increasing. About 2.3 million pieces of chemical munitions abandoned in China by the foreign State have been found so far. Among them roughly 300,000 pieces have been destroyed or given preliminary treatment by China, with approximately 2 million pieces yet to be destroyed. Since most of these chemical munitions are still buried, the exact figure has yet to be verified after excavation. In addition, about 120 tons of toxic chemical agents abandoned by the foreign State in China have been discovered, among which more than 20 tons have been destroyed by China. The present state of affairs in this regard has been a source of bitter grievance and serious concern for the Chinese people.

(Mr. Hu, China)

Information on the types of these chemical munitions and toxic agents and their geographical distribution is contained in document CD/1127 submitted by my delegation. Please allow me to point out that, in the English text of this document, there are two technical errors, one towards the end of page 2 and the other towards the end of page 4. In this regard the secretariat has issued a corrigendum. The Chinese leadership and the Chinese delegation have on many occasions expounded our principled position and propositions on the issue of abandoned chemical weapons, and I am not going to repeat all of them today. However, in the interest of resolving the issue of abandoned chemical weapons in the negotiations as soon as possible, we find it necessary to emphasize the following. Firstly, the complete destruction of abandoned chemical weapons is of close relevance to the objective of the convention and constitutes an essential and important part of the convention. In this respect no gap or lacuna can be allowed. Secondly, the issue of abandoned chemical weapons is by no means a mere "historical problem", but rather an important one of relevance to both the present and the future. Nor is it an issue that concerns only a few victim States, but rather one that has a bearing on the basic rights and obligations of all States parties. It is, therefore, an important issue of relevance to the maintenance of international peace and security. Thirdly, the key to the resolution of the issue of abandoned chemical weapons lies in the attribution of responsibility for their destruction. The convention must lay down in fair and clear terms the principle that a State which has used and abandoned chemical weapons shall bear the responsibility for their destruction.

On the basis of the above-mentioned position of principle, the Chinese delegation has put forward and will continue to put forward concrete and constructive proposals. For example, bearing in mind the similarities as well as the dissimilarities in the circumstances in which chemical weapons were abandoned, we maintain that the following wording should be included in the convention: "Each State party undertakes to destroy all chemical weapons it has abandoned on the territory of another State, and the States concerned may on this basis seek proper solutions through consultations among themselves." The second part of this wording is flexible enough to accommodate all kinds of circumstances and the corresponding solutions.

Apart from the key issue of responsibility for destruction, we are of the opinion that it is also necessary to make some additions and modifications related to abandoned chemical weapons in articles III and IV and their annexes. Proceeding from these points, the Chinese delegation has outlined its position of principle, propositions and specific proposals on the issue of abandoned chemical weapons in document CD/1130. We hope that these propositions and proposals will be considered in all seriousness by the CD and the Ad Hoc Committee on CW and fully reflected in the "rolling text", and in this regard we are ready to continue our constructive cooperation with all other delegations.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the representative of China for his statement and his kind words addressed to myself.

We have now reached the end of the list of speakers. Does any other representative wish to speak? The representative of Japan, Ambassador Donowaki, has the floor.

Mr. DONOWAKI (Japan): Mr. President, first of all, I would like to reaffirm my delegation's pleasure in seeing you in the Chair, and we are confident that under your able and skilful chairmanship our work in the CD will make successful progress. I should also like to express to the previous President, Ambassador Calovski of Yugoslavia, my delegation's sincere appreciation for the great contribution he made at the beginning of this session of the Conference. May I also state that we listened with great interest to the important statement made by the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Poland, His Excellency Mr. Kostarczyk? I should also like to express my delegation's gratitude for the contribution made by Ambassador Konatina over the years in the Conference on Disarmament and our regret that he will be leaving us soon.

The purpose of my intervention is, of course, to state the position of my Government on the question raised by the previous speaker. I listened with much interest to the statement that the Chinese Government has great interest in achieving the chemical weapons convention this year, and was very encouraged by the reference to the four-nation proposal on challenge inspection to which the Chinese Government has been giving serious consideration, since Japan is one of the co-sponsors of the four-nation proposal. I am very much encouraged by that fact. On the question of old and abandoned chemical weapons, my delegation has taken a consistent policy for some time, but perhaps it is important to repeat it to help achieve an early conclusion of the negotiations. The purpose of our negotiations, as the previous speaker pointed out, is to achieve a convention which will effectively destroy existing chemical weapons. Of course, we know that some States have a large stock of chemical weapons. One of the major purposes of the convention is to deal with these. At the same time, however, we should also take into account the importance of destroying old and abandoned chemical weapons. The purpose of the convention is also, in the long term, to prevent the production of chemical weapons by introducing a system to check compliance with it - a very complicated task. That is why our negotiations are going through very difficult phases. So these are the broad objectives of our convention which should be formulated in such a way that there will be no gaps or loopholes in achieving this purpose.

We have to make sure that all possible cases of old and abandoned chemical weapons will be covered by the convention, not only those referred to in the working paper submitted concerning our two countries, but also others - and each case is different. For that reason, the work and consultations being conducted by Friend of the Chair Ambassador Brotodiningrat of Indonesia are very important, and we highly appreciate the efforts he is making. My delegation will make every constructive effort to cooperate with him in finding an early solution, together with other countries.

(Mr. Donowaki, Japan)

However, my delegation's position is that this Conference is not the forum for bilateral issues. In the case of the latter, we have been making honest and serious efforts, apart from the negotiations in this Conference, and we are working towards a successful settlement of them. I do not wish therefore to dwell upon this side of our efforts. I will simply state that the working paper submitted this morning gives preliminary data exemplifying one case of abandoned weapons.

In order to arrive at a satisfactory framework for dealing with the question of abandoned chemical weapons, I have to reiterate the positions we have consistently taken on this question. Old and abandoned chemical weapons discovered by States parties to this convention will not all be of the same type - there are many different varieties. Also, it is a fact that any State party has sovereignty over its territory and should have primary concern for the destruction of such weapons. I do not insist that this should be stated as a responsibility, but rather as a concern - in normal cases - for the country which finds such weapons on its territory. The amount may be small, and the time that has elapsed between the abandoning and discovery may be so long that they may not be poisoned or dangerous and might perhaps be dealt with as a question of environmental hazard. This should be easy to do in many cases. However, there may be other cases where a country discovering such old and abandoned weapons may not find it easy to destroy them.

As regards provision in the convention - as may be supported by some States members of this Conference - if destruction is to be made the responsibility of the abandoning State, then it is my delegation's view that this may introduce complications, because the abandoning State will not normally have jurisdiction or the sovereign right to enter the territory of another State party where abandoned chemical weapons may be discovered; also, it may sometimes be very difficult to establish or identify the country which may have abandoned them. The abandoning State may not be a State party to the Convention. Thus, a loophole or gap may be created, i.e., that nobody will destroy such dangerous abandoned weapons. The existing provisions of the "rolling text", after many years of negotiations, seem to have received the support of most nations. My delegation believes that if it is established that a certain country has abandoned old chemical weapons and the country where they are discovered wishes the abandoning country to cooperate, such an arrangement should certainly be provided for in the convention. We will carefully study the concrete proposals which the Chinese delegation has presented in the past and today. In particular, my delegation is interested in the proposal regarding article X, for cases where the identity of abandoned chemical weapons has not been established, providing for assistance in their destruction by the technical secretariat. That kind of provision is one way to close the gap, so in that sense my delegation will be greatly interested in studying further that kind of very constructive proposal.

Also I should like to point out that even in the Chairman's summary on this question for 1990 it was stated that the discovering State should not a priori be made responsible for the destruction of such weapons. At the same time, however, it did not state that the abandoning State should have this

(Mr. Donowaki, Japan)

responsibility. The question of responsibility is a very delicate one and if we try to provide for the responsibility of States retroactively for who knows how many years, we will create some confusion. For that reason my delegation believes that a more practical approach, rather than establishing such responsibility, would be to make appropriate provisions to settle the question satisfactorily. My delegation is ready to make concrete proposals which should be feasible, practical and conducive to the settlement of this question in our negotiations.

Of course, we are aware that in connection with the question of old and abandoned chemical weapons, there are suggestions that perhaps a cut-off date should be set at a certain point in the past which might help solve the problem to a great extent. My delegation may agree to such suggestions. But all these matters should be discussed in the consultations to be conducted by the Friend of the Chair, the Ambassador of Indonesia.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the representative of Japan for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to me.

As you know, during the informal consultations open to all members of the Conference held last Tuesday, we continued consideration of the request addressed to us by the United Nations General Assembly in its resolution 46/36L, entitled "Transparency in armaments". These consultations proved very useful. Some small progress has been made, though we have not yet reached agreement on all issues pertaining to the General Assembly's request. Nonetheless, several delegations have stressed the importance of the appointment of a special coordinator for all aspects relating to the issue before us, including all organizational aspects as well as the substantive aspects of this subject. Bearing in mind this agreement, it would be wise to appoint the special coordinator with this general mandate I have just indicated. I intend to do so in the next few days, and I will keep you informed of the choice of the person assigned to these responsibilities.

Allow me now to turn to other matters. With the exception of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, which has already begun its work, and the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Cooperative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events, which will hold its next session from 2 to 13 March 1992, the other subsidiary bodies of the Conference are not yet ready to meet. The chairmen of the ad hoc committees have informed the secretariat that they are continuing their consultations with a view to the organization of work and the programme of meetings. Consequently I deemed it superfluous to circulate today a timetable of meetings for next week. The secretariat has requested me to inform you that the opening meeting of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts will take place on Monday, 2 March at 11 a.m. in Conference Room XI, and subsequent meetings will take place daily at 10 a.m. in the same room.

As regards our programme of informal meetings on the substance of agenda items 2 and 3, I would like to inform you that, immediately after the plenary meeting on Thursday, 12 March, the Conference will hold its first meeting devoted to item 2, entitled "Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear

(The President)

disarmament", so as to give delegations time to prepare their statements. We will hence have two weeks to develop our positions. It is not essential for delegations to put their names down on the list of speakers in advance; nonetheless, it would be helpful if they did so to make it easier for the secretariat to organize the timetable of informal meetings.

Dear friends, with your permission I should like to devote the last part of this plenary meeting to a brief statement. It is not without a degree of emotion that I find myself called upon today to address a few words to His Excellency Ambassador Miljan Komatina, Secretary-General and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, on your behalf and on my own behalf. At our next plenary meeting we will not have the honour and pleasure of having him in our midst. Though sad, this is a valuable opportunity to bear witness here once again to Ambassador Komatina of our profound respect and loyal friendship which are engraved on our hearts for the skill, diplomatic savoir faire and experience which he has supplied during seven years of work in the Conference on Disarmament.

Ambassador Miljan Komatina served his country with distinction in a number of diplomatic posts and also performed important duties in his national administration. But undoubtedly it was above all his wisdom, his intelligence and his skills in multilateral affairs that led to his appointment to the post he has occupied with such devotion to date. Ambassador Komatina is a brilliant intellectual, an expert in international relations. He is the author of a number of articles published in the International Foreign Policy Review in Yugoslavia, which in fact awarded him its annual prize for 1983, and he has taught in the Faculty of Political Sciences in Belgrade. Each of us will remember his personality radiant with cordiality, overflowing with human warmth and full of zest and youthfulness. And this memory, dear Secretary-General, is perhaps the greatest gift we could offer you, and when you leave this room and this podium, reflect that our deepest friendship will accompany you always and everywhere. Reflect that this friendship is in a way a piece of the heart of each of us which you will be taking with you, far from us. We hope to see you enjoy a happy retirement, peaceful, full of good health and good spirits. We extend to Ambassador Komatina and his charming and pleasant wife Mina our best wishes for this new stage in their lives. Once again, on behalf of the Conference on Disarmament, a hearty thank you and our most sincere congratulations on your work.

I give the floor to the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Mr. Mashhadi, who will be speaking as coordinator of the Group of 21.

Mr. MASHHADI (Islamic Republic of Iran): Mr. President, on behalf of the Group of 21, I would like to take this opportunity in joining you who spoke before me to pay tribute to Ambassador Komatina who was with us in the last eight years and who is retiring now as the Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament and Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

(Mr. Mashhadi, Islamic Republic of Iran)

During the difficult years of the cold war in the 1980s, Ambassador Komatina wisely and efficiently led the secretariat in performing its task which in most cases was challenging if not impossible. In addition to his efficient capability of directing the work of the CD, his personal values, integrity, devotion and ever-smiling face helped us greatly to overcome sometimes unbearable difficulties. His person was an irreplaceable asset to all of us and the Conference. He is leaving us now that the CD has entered a new stage in international relations. Confrontation has given way to cooperation in relations among States and as a result the window of opportunity is opened before us along with its challenges. The CD needs him more than ever before in this new era now that there are great hopes for revitalization of dormant agenda items in our work programme.

The members of the Group of 21 all wish to express their appreciation and thanks to Ambassador Komatina for his valuable contribution to the cause of peace and disarmament. We are sure that although his retirement will deny us his physical presence here, yet the CD will always remember him as a man who contributed immensely to the lofty goals which constituted the raison d'etre of this conference and he will be remembered by all of us and those who will come here after us.

Once again on behalf of the Group of 21 I would like to pay tribute to him and wish him and his family all the best.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran for his statement on behalf of the Group of 21. I now give the floor to the representative of Romania, Ambassador Neagu, in his capacity as Coordinator of the Group of Eastern European States.

Mr. NEAGU (Romania): Mr. President, before delivering my statement, allow me to join the previous speakers who expressed satisfaction at your assumption of the presidency of the Conference for the month of February. I am sure that your tact and great experience will have a decisive influence on the successful conclusion of this phase of our deliberations. I want to assure you that the Romanian delegation will render to you all support in discharging your important duties. I also wish to pay tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Calovski, the representative of Yugoslavia, who deployed with diligence a great amount of work in order to have a good start to this year's session of the Conference. May I also welcome our new colleagues from Belgium, Ambassador Servais, and from Mongolia, Ambassador Yumjav? I would like to welcome in our midst His Excellency the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Poland, Mr. Andrzej Kostarczyk, whose intervention I highly appreciate.

On behalf of the Group consisting of the representatives of Bulgaria, the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, Hungary, Poland, the Russian Federation and Romania, it is an honour for me to express to Ambassador Komatina our deep appreciation for his brilliant diplomatic career and, in particular, his devotion to the cause of curbing the armaments drive, for the competent way he performed his duties as Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament and Personal Representative of the United Nations Secretary-General at the Conference.

(Mr. Neagu, Romania)

As a prominent political personality in his country, in the Non-Aligned Movement and in the United Nations system, Ambassador Komatina needs no introduction. Seven years have elapsed since he reiterated his strong commitment to the common endeavour in the pursuit of disarmament within this multilateral negotiating body entrusted with the most crucial agenda mankind has ever dealt with. During this period he made an active contribution to the progress of the negotiations carried on by the Conference on Disarmament and spared no effort to assist this forum in discharging its responsibilities in the best possible way.

Ambassador Komatina served the Conference with great dedication and brought to the position of CD Secretary-General the diplomatic skills and experience acquired in multilateral affairs and in senior government posts in his country. We all benefited from his many talents and qualities and relied on his advice and support in our work. We would like to emphasize how much we feel privileged to have been working with him, an outstanding international official and a distinguished representative of a friendly country. It is indeed a source of pride for us to be numbered among his personal friends. In a few hours, Ambassador Komatina will be leaving Geneva. May I convey to him our best wishes for an enjoyable well-deserved retirement, happiness in his personal life and the assurance that, whenever he comes to Geneva, he can count on his friends here?

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the representative of Romania for his statement on behalf of the Group of Eastern European States, as well as the kind words addressed to myself. I now give the floor to the representative of Australia, Ambassador O'Sullivan, on behalf of the group of Western countries.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN (Australia): Mr. President, on behalf of the Western group of countries, I would like to join you and other speakers this morning in paying tribute to Ambassador Komatina on this occasion of his last plenary meeting as Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament.

Ambassador Komatina's appointment to this important position came, as other speakers have already noted, after a long and distinguished diplomatic career, first in the service of his own country and subsequently in the service of the international community via the United Nations. Over the past eight years, Ambassador Komatina has ably directed the secretariat staff and greatly assisted in the smooth functioning of this Conference. These tasks would not always have been easy to perform, but Ambassador Komatina managed to approach them with his very special combination of tact and vigour. Above all, Ambassador Komatina brought with him, and applied in his position as Secretary-General, a wealth of knowledge and experience which proved invaluable to the Conference as a whole, and more particularly to those of our colleagues who served as Conference President. His service in pursuit of our common goals of peace, security and disarmament are deeply appreciated.

The members of the Western group would like to wish both Ambassador Komatina and his family the very best wishes for his retirement. Perhaps relieved of the pressures of his position he will find time to add to his already impressive list of publications. We look forward to them.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the representative of Australia for his statement on behalf of the group of Western countries. I now give the floor to the representative of China, Mr. Hu Xiaodi.

Mr. HU (China) (translated from Chinese): The Chinese delegation learned with a sense of regret of the impending departure of the distinguished Ambassador Komatina, who will no longer be the Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament. Ambassador Komatina comes from a friendly State, Yugoslavia, and he is a renowned diplomat and an expert on disarmament affairs of great international esteem. As the Secretary-General of the Conference as well as Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, he has exerted untiring efforts in promoting the cause of international disarmament and has made a praiseworthy contribution to the smooth functioning of the Conference. His rich experience and his dedication to his work has benefited every one of us in no small way. At the same time, through our cooperation over the past seven years since he took up the post of Secretary-General of the Conference, Ambassador Komatina and the Chinese delegation have built a solid friendship between us. His departure will be an enormous loss for the Conference. However, we can draw some comfort from the expectation that, although Ambassador Komatina will no longer occupy the post of Secretary-General of the Conference, he is bound to maintain a keen interest in our work, and he will provide us in the future with valuable suggestions and guidance. Finally, the Chinese delegation wishes Ambassador Komatina and Mrs. Komatina good health and every success in their private life and future work.

The PRESIDENT: (translated from French): I thank the representative of China for his statement. Now we give the floor to our friend Ambassador Komatina.

Mr. KOMATINA (Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations) (translated from French): I am not a speaker on the list - I'm not sure that I have that right. I have often shared my views with you, very often in abundance, individually or in groups, and I should like to avoid repetition. But I would nevertheless like to say a few words of a personal rather than professional nature. I am very touched and moved by the kind words which have been addressed to me by you, Mr. President, and by the representatives of Poland, Hungary, Canada, Japan, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Romania, Australia and China, speaking on their own behalf or on behalf of their groups. This is yet another testimony of the friendship which I have always received and continue to receive from my colleagues of all generations, your predecessors just as much as yourselves.

I am leaving the Conference with a feeling, if not of a "mission accomplished", at least of a mission that has succeeded. I do not say this as an empty boast or with false modesty. Since there is no such thing as a mission that is totally accomplished in the field in which we work, I view my mission as a successful one in the sense that I have always sought, sometimes

(Mr. Komatina, Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations)

even found, at any rate I have tried to identify points in common in divergent positions and to build bridges between the different viewpoints whenever and wherever that was possible. I have spared no effort to reconcile, to overcome divisions, at least as far as the functioning of the Conference goes, and if I haven't succeeded, it is not because I haven't tried.

The second comment I wish to make is to offer you my apologies for having tried to "take French leave" in a cowardly manner. This is linked purely to personal reasons connected with my frame of mind. First of all, I don't like ceremonies involving leave-taking, separation or departure, because very often, if not always, they are sad. A poet said that to leave is always to die a little. But I would say that to change is always to be reborn a little. At any rate, I prefer to control my feelings and take them away with me. However, the main reason lies in the fact that I am experiencing a kind of mourning, with the feeling of participating in a sort of funeral procession. Even though I may be "out of order" in speaking of this, I would like to share this feeling with you, because the problems are linked with the events that affect security. This is due, as you may have guessed, to what is going on in and around my native country - in my country, and I add around it, because, without entering into details, the responsibilities are not attributable solely to backward Balkan nationalism leading to balkanization or heaven knows what. There is a power game, a kind of geopolitics which has been revived with harmful consequences. Those who are familiar with history will understand this, because it is being repeated in a striking fashion. The English short story writer Saki correctly noted that the Balkans produce more history than they can consume. At any rate, I have the impression of going back in time.

I used to represent a different country, a country of which I was proud. Yugoslavia is not, as far as I'm concerned, one nation, still less one religion, one ideology or social system that has been wrongly christened with different names at different times, but rather it is an ongoing enterprise of solidarity and reconciliation among peoples, nations and minorities with different historical, religious, ethnic and cultural backgrounds which have too often been manipulated and pitted one against the other. These peoples have for the first time in their history lived in peace for almost half a century, and an immense effort has been made to forget the massacres of the Second World War, genocides even, which were perpetrated on their territory and between themselves. Recent developments, unfortunately, have highlighted the risk that the bonds of cohesion, coherence, may be entirely shattered. Despite optimism that these bonds will be maintained at least in part - and ultimately they will be re-established sooner or later - I cannot help regarding these developments as a kind of personal setback, though I hope only a temporary one. I was wrong to believe that at least certain aspects of Realpolitik had changed, if not disappeared, in a Europe which is writing a new page of its history. But as Plato said - I learned this a bit too late - individual ethics is never identical to political ethics. I hope I will have

(Mr. Komatina, Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations)

the strength to avoid bitterness, cynicism or doom-preaching. I certainly do not wish to give up hope, still less to wash my hands of the matter. There are always things to be done, a number of struggles to be waged against the backward drift. Perhaps we in Yugoslavia didn't have enough time to consolidate our federal system; other countries required a whole century to consolidate the achievements of their revolutions, and sometimes this involved civil war. I have been inspired to say these few words by an article by the American Ambassador in Belgrade that appeared in a Yugoslav paper, but this is scant consolation for what happened in my country, which I hope will not happen again.

I have tried to serve the Conference in an impartial, committed and active fashion, always trying to reconcile the neutrality of an international civil servant with my personal convictions, without losing my identity, preserving a critical outlook, remaining open to criticism and prepared to correct myself. If, as Kant said, I cannot boast that I have always said what I thought, I can at least claim that I have never said what I did not think. My task was greatly facilitated because I was surrounded by effective colleagues. To name them all would be a difficult endeavour, because they all deserve special mention. However, I cannot fail to congratulate Ambassador Berasategui, my deputy until today, on his appointment to new responsibilities. You are all acquainted with him and no words of introduction are necessary.

At another level, I would like to underscore that I was lucky in being involved in the Conference at a period of extremely important changes. While this is not the "end of history", these events do offer new prospects for a different mode of operation of the international system, the emergence of a different world and gradually perhaps even a new world. These changes create the conditions, if not for the harmonious development of inter-State relations, at least for a higher degree of the gradual unification of values and conduct. I say this without, of course, overlooking the formidable obstacles with which this path is fraught. This process is not pre-ordained either in one direction or the other. Vigilant efforts will be required to translate these potentialities and energies into practice and to extend the values which we want to promote in our national societies, to extend themn and translate them into international life. If we fail to do this, what has been accomplished will be elusive and may be lost. For if we have learnt anything at all from recent developments, it is that stability based on military supremacy, reflected in the arms race, or on permanent manoeuvres to blunt international contradictions by means of improvized compromises without resolving them would be fragile.

Arms control and disarmament has indeed begun in recent years, but to continue along this path we need new approaches which would deepen the process, speed it up and above all offer it qualitatively new dimensions. Such approaches would make it possible to penetrate into the "grey areas"

(Mr. Komatina, Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations)

which thus far have remained beyond us, such as the problem of cooperation in military technologies, the arms trade, production and use of weapons of mass destruction, non-proliferation and especially the establishment of a common system of security. All this cannot be done unless recourse is continuously made to the United Nations as the source of initiatives and the nucleus of the new international order.

As for the Conference, it is beginning to change gradually, and sometimes in an imperceptible way, in parallel with the changes in the system of international relations. As with all institutions, they lag behind what is going on in real life. Our Conference, however, represents more than just an institution; it represents a concept of international cooperation in disarmament and a process that generates universal responsibility for security. To use its full potential we must begin first and foremost by understanding what is taking place in the world, by understanding the nature of change, being clear about what has really changed and what has remained the same. It is perhaps still too early to sketch an overall picture or draw final conclusions. The changes were sudden, surprising, unpredictable, if not in their substance and direction, at least in their immediate consequences, and they do not all work in the same direction, the desired direction. What is certain is that the nature of the conflict has changed; the balance of strength has become fragile, the operation of the international system has improved; but the factors of destabilization and the challenges have diversified. The nature of the system has been only superficially transformed, with inequalities that have become more marked and new cases of marginalization that have emerged. One should never forget that 80 per cent of people remain unaffected by the new trends in international life. Disarmament has acquired new dimensions and plays a different role, but it does not cover all military activities. We do not yet know how the vacuum created by the change that has occurred on the global scene will be filled. But if, as we expect, disarmament becomes a common endeavour and a norm in present-day life through ongoing negotiations, the role of the Conference will be strengthened and negotiations would, of necessity become multilateralized.

To achieve this, our Conference must nevertheless make a bold commitment to defining new tasks which, without abandoning the negotiated character of disarmament treaties, could participate in different, more flexible ways in the elaboration of security systems and the new agenda. There is no problem that the Conference could not take up in exploring what is immediately feasible to improve conditions and broadening the space for future negotiations. Realism should not, however, be conceived of as the granting of concessions to the "other side", the lowering of sights or the transformation of the Conference into a debating club. It is more a question of mutual understanding of what can be achieved today and tomorrow and making a commitment to this in a climate of complete transparency of positions and responsibilities.

(Mr. Komatina, Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations)

The Conference is an institution for the democratization of international life and for collective participation in a field that historically was the preserve of the major Powers or those which possessed powerful armaments. While there is something true in the globalization of problems, their globalization, interdependence, disarmament and security problems will become increasingly multilateral, and not in the technical sense reflected in the number of negotiators or participants in the negotiations but in the conceptual sense. The Conference must not only survive but continue in the new conditions to play a central role. To what extent this general trend towards multilateralization will be reflected in the facts will depend on our ability to understand the new agenda, our readiness to act and adapt our goals and means. If the problem is approached in this manner, the boundaries between multilateral, regional and bilateral negotiations will gradually disappear. I am certain that the Conference is on the threshold of making history with the convention on chemical weapons by elaborating the most comprehensive system of security and cooperation in the history of disarmament, which of course would strengthen its role and give it self-confidence. The Conference, in the shape of all that it contains, reflects or implies, is a complex endeavour all of whose effects are difficult to gauge, but to the extent that the process of standardizing criteria for analysing and synthesizing the new realities continues, we may view its future with optimism. We should avoid the risk that the defeat of fundamentalist ideologies will become the defeat of ideas, or that the failure of one aggressive ideology will be replaced by others.

Mr. President, dear colleagues and friends, I reiterate my very sincere thanks to all of you. I extend my best wishes to each of you in your private lives and in your work, and I wish the Conference every success.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): This sustained ovation bears eloquent witness to the interest and the attention with which each of us followed the important statement by our friend, Secretary-General Ambassador Komatina. Through that statement we have yet once again noted his wealth of intelligence, his sensitivity, his dynamism and his commitment, all of which will be denied to us by his departure. On behalf of all of you, and on my own behalf, once again we wish to thank Ambassador Komatina for his major contribution to the work of the Conference.

There are no further matters before us today, and so I shall adjourn the meeting, requesting the distinguished representatives to remain in the room for a few minutes after the meeting is adjourned. The next plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament will take place on Thursday 5 March at 10 a.m.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.615
5 March 1992

ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE SIX HUNDRED AND FIFTEENTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 5 March 1992, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. Mutuale Kikanke (Zaire)

GE.92-60584/4318B

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I declare open the 615th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

First of all it is my pleasure to extend a warm welcome, on behalf of the Conference and on my own behalf, to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zaire, His Excellency Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya. It has become traditional for the President to introduce the eminent persons who honour our Conference with their presence, but where my own Foreign Minister is concerned, you will understand the difficulty of my position. Where should I decently begin in introducing to you the Minister who before me, in June of 1985, had the responsibility of presiding over the Conference? At that time, he was Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Zaire to the United Nations Office at Geneva, and I am sure that there are many of you who have already listened to him and with whom he had already collaborated. And just before becoming Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zaire, Mr. Bagbeni was the Permanent Representative of Zaire at United Nations Headquarters in New York, and in that capacity he was called on to preside over the Security Council during one of the periods which will certainly go down in the history of the United Nations and the Security Council. The Minister's career has been very extensive, very long and very brilliant. He has been an official, he has been a diplomat, he has been and still is a politician, a statesman. He was such a skilled official that he became the top official in Zaire - that is to say, Minister of the Civil Service; he was such a brilliant diplomat that he became the top diplomat of Zaire - that is to say, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zaire. This demonstrates that it would take a long time to describe such a brilliant career. I could sum up by saying that Minister Bagbeni is one of the jewels of the Zairian diplomatic corps and at the same time a respected authority in political circles in Zaire. We view his presence among us both as a source of inspiration and also as a testimony of the importance that Zaire attaches to the work of our Conference.

I also wish to extend a warm welcome to the Secretary-General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Italy, His Excellency Ambassador Bruno Bottai. Ambassador Bottai has already participated in our work, on 7 August 1990, when he addressed the plenary of the Conference for the first time. He has taken up important diplomatic duties, having been appointed Ambassador of Italy to the Holy See and also to the Court of St. James's, and, as my predecessor remarked on the occasion of his previous visit, he has also been diplomatic adviser to the Prime Minister of Italy. His presence here bears witness to his country's interest in all disarmament-related matters. I am sure that the Conference will listen to his statement with very special interest.

Allow me now to turn to my left and express on behalf of the entire Conference, and on my own behalf, our congratulations to Ambassador Vicente Ernesto Berasategui on the occasion of his appointment to the post of Secretary-General of the Conference and Personal Representative of the United Nations Secretary-General at the Conference. I would not venture to introduce to you a man whose merit, competence, discretion, sense of moderation and respect for others' convictions are well known to each of you. Ambassador Berasategui is a well-known personality in our Conference. Indeed, many of you could do a better job of introducing him than I can because he has

(The President)

been giving us the benefit of his valuable cooperation on this podium since 1979. Our Secretary-General is a brilliant lawyer from the University of Buenos Aires, and after obtaining a Master's degree in international relations and organizations at the American University in Washington, D.C., he took up a wide range of important duties in the Foreign Ministry of his country, Argentina, rising through all the levels of the administration and representing his country at innumerable international assemblies and meetings, either as head of delegation or as member of a delegation. Ambassador Berasategui has extremely extensive experience in disarmament matters. For example, he had a position on the Committee on Disarmament for many years; he was an observer at several international meetings on disarmament.

I should also like to extend a cordial welcome to the participants in the conference organized on the theme "Economic, social and cultural rights as a prerequisite for peace" who are attending our plenary meeting today. As you are aware, each year women's organizations meet in the Palais des Nations on the occasion of International Women's Day, which was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly and is celebrated throughout the world. Our Conference has played a part in this event of paramount importance by becoming acquainted with the viewpoints and concerns expressed by the women gathered here representing organizations and groups in many countries. With your permission I will now invite the Secretary-General of the Conference and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations to read out the message addressed to the Conference by the women meeting here.

Mr. BERASATEGUI (Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations) (translated from French): First of all, Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the words of welcome you addressed to His Excellency the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zaire, Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, with whom I had the honour and pleasure of cooperating when he occupied the Chair of the Conference in June 1985, and His Excellency the Secretary-General of Foreign Affairs of Italy, Ambassador Bruno Bottai, as well as the participants in the conference organized on the occasion of International Women's Day. I would also like to thank you for your kind words to me on the occasion of my appointment as Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali.

I hope to discharge my new responsibilities with the same effectiveness and the same devotion as my predecessors, Ambassador Miljan Komatina and Ambassador Riki Jaipal, the first Secretary-General of the Conference, who took on the responsibility of the burdensome task of reorganizing the multilateral negotiating body after the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. I would like to pay tribute to their skills and their wisdom, which were of inestimable value for the Conference and also for the secretariat.

The secretariat and myself remain at the disposal of all delegations for any matter relating to the work of the Conference.

(Mr. Berasategui, Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations)

I would now like to read out the following message, addressed to the members of our Conference by the participants in the conference organized on the theme "Economic, social and cultural rights as a prerequisite for peace".

"This is the eighth year that we women gather in Geneva to mark International Women's Day. Once again we take this opportunity to observe a public session of the Conference on Disarmament and to express to you our interest in and support for your efforts to conclude agreements that can make our lives and our planet safer.

"We are fully aware that the Conference on Disarmament cannot function in a vacuum, and that successful negotiations depend not only on the good will and concerted efforts of its members, but to a large extent on the state of relations among nations and their Governments.

"As we noted a year ago, the dramatic changes that had taken place in the relations among European States, easing and eliminating East-West tensions, should open the way to rapid progress in a number of areas of disarmament negotiations. Our concern was then and remains so today, that after many years of discussions and negotiations, a treaty prohibiting the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons and for their destruction has still to be concluded. We note the expressed determination in the Conference on Disarmament that the chemical weapons treaty should be concluded before the end of this year. We are aware of the fact that a number of obstacles have been removed. However, we are aware also that obstacles, including obstacles in the area of verification, still exist. From your point of view, what can we activists for disarmament do to help lower and remove these obstacles?

"We note with satisfaction that the Conference on Disarmament will concern itself with the question of transparency in armaments. As citizens, we commit ourselves to be vigilant in our respective countries as to the development and maintenance of transparency in this new area.

"Later this year, the world's Governments will gather in Brazil in the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development. We are dismayed that the negative impact of military activities on environment and development receives so little attention in the preparatory process of the Conference. We appeal to this Conference, composed of members aware of, and knowledgeable about this link, to look into possible contributions to the development of international treaties and conventions.

"One aspect of this link is the continuation of nuclear weapons testing. We feel strongly that nuclear testing programmes should be stopped. Also, given the dangers that testing poses to the environment and the health of populations, and given the new and increasing dangers

(Mr. Berasategui, Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations)

of proliferation, we urgently appeal to this Conference to advance its work towards agreements on the prohibition of the development production and stockpiling of nuclear weapons and providing for the elimination of existing weapons.

"We welcome, of course, the significant agreements that have been reached between the United States and the former USSR and between NATO and the former Warsaw Treaty Organization in dismantling certain categories of weapons and reducing nuclear forces. We welcome the statements made in recent months by both the Governments of the United States and the Russian Republic to further reduce the stockpiles and eliminate categories of weapons. A genuine disarmament race would indeed be a very welcome way to travel into the 21st century.

"It is our ardent hope that all nations join in this race and that this Conference on Disarmament will assume the high task of negotiating and concluding rapidly the necessary treaties.

"We are concerned, as we are confident you are, for the lives of this and future generations, and for the health of our planet on which all life depends. It is everyone's responsibility to work for a peaceful future. But we look to you, having a particular responsibility for disarmament which is an essential component of the conditions for life to continue, with great expectations to rapidly pave the way with the greatest urgency.

"We wish you every success, and again assure you of our full co-operation".

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the Secretary-General of the Conference for reading out the message from the participants in the conference organized on the occasion of International Women's Day. On behalf of the Conference, I thank them for the statement devoted to disarmament issues and wish them every success in their deliberations. I also wish to offer all the women associated with the work of the Conference on Disarmament our warmest wishes on the forthcoming occasion of International Women's Day, on Sunday, 8 March.

Before starting on the list of speakers for today, I would like to ask whether any delegations wish to take the floor at this stage, following the statement we have just heard. I give the floor to the representative of Australia.

Mr. MORRIS (Australia): Firstly, may I, too, welcome the presence in our Conference today of His Excellency the Minister for External Affairs of Zaire, Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, and of His Excellency the Secretary-General of the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ambassador Bottai? Also, could I take the opportunity to express once again the satisfaction and congratulations

(Mr. Morris, Australia)

of the Western Group on the assumption to the posts of Personal Representative of the Secretary-General and Secretary-General of the Conference, to Ambassador Berasategui?

I have the honour to make the following statement on behalf of a group of Western countries. We are pleased to welcome back in the public gallery today the women who have gathered here once again to mark International Women's Day and who will now devote three days to discussion and reflection on current issues related to our common endeavours for the promotion of international peace and security. We pay particular homage to the organizers of this annual event, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, which was founded in April 1915, by women from belligerent and non-belligerent countries alike, in protest at the carnage of the First World War. The League is one of the oldest non-governmental organizations still working actively for the promotion of peace today.

The end of the cold war has brought with it greatly enhanced opportunities for organizations which are committed to the promotion of global peace and stability - both governmental and non-governmental - to move closer towards their common goals. Here in the Conference on Disarmament there are opportunities to be seized. The negotiations for a chemical weapons convention being conducted in the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons is a particular and indeed pressing case in point. An effective convention can be concluded this year, and this is a major challenge for us here in Geneva.

When international agreements are reached on arms control and disarmament issues, international norms for behaviour which will impact on all world citizens are established. Clearly, in order to be effectively implemented and respected, such rules must be based absolutely on principles of equal rights and opportunitites. Women carry with them a long and often painful history of struggle for the attainment of equal rights and opportunities. And while they have not shirked their responsibilities in taking on equal obligations, they continue to be faced all too frequently with barriers to gaining the equal rights and opportunities to which they are entitled.

An issue of continuing concern to us is the improvement of the status of women in the United Nations Secretariat. It is worth reiterating why this issue is so important and fundamental. Firstly, women's equality is a matter of basic human rights and social justice - as stated in Article 1 of the Charter of the United Nations. Secondly, in an international secretariat, just as there is a need for widespread geographical distribution in order that the problems of no region be overlooked, so it is necessary for women to be represented at senior policy-making levels in order that the problems of half the human race, and the way in which the United Nations programmes affect them, be fully taken into account. Finally, the equitable promotion of women on the basis of their merit can only improve the efficiency of the Organization. It will ensure that highly talented staff irrespective of their gender are not prevented from attaining positions commensurate with their abilities.

(Mr. Morris, Australia)

There has recently been some progress towards the goal of equality in the United Nations. 1991 saw the appointment of Mrs. Ogata, as United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, and of Ms. Catherine Bertinais as Executive Director of the United Nations World Food Programme. This brought to three the total number of women who have headed the 31 major United Nations agencies since 1946. Overall women remain under-represented in the United Nations professional staff. They constitute not quite 30 per cent of the professional staff. And the pace of progress towards equality continues to be painfully slow. Over the past decade there has been a rise of less than 1 per cent in the level of professional women's representation in the United Nations. And yet the Secretary-General states in his 1991 Annual Report that, as a concern, gender equality is second to none. I regret to say that the available evidence suggests that the concern exhibited by the Secretary-General is not reflected in practice throughout the United Nations. The lack of progress over the past few years shows that greater commitment is needed on the part of the senior managers of this Organization to the advancement of women. And this commitment needs to be demonstrated clearly.

The theme for this year's International Women's Day is "Economic, Social and Cultural Rights as a Prerequisite to Peace: A Challenge to Women". The importance of economic and social progress for women, and equally the importance of women's role in achieving this progress, is one of the major preoccupations of the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women, which will begin its thirty-sixth session in Vienna next week. Indeed, "development" and "peace" are two of the three priority themes of the United Nations Forward-looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women to the year 2000. At its thirty-sixth session the Commission on the Status of Women will consider, under the theme of development, "Integration of women in the process of development" and under the theme of peace, "Women's equal participation in all efforts for international cooperation, peace and disarmament".

The issues to be considered thus take on particular significance for the work of the Conference on Disarmament. While in New York there is a reasonable number of women engaged in disarmament affairs, it is of great concern that at the Geneva end only one of the five Professional positions is held by a woman. In this context the United Nations General Assembly has urged the Secretary-General to accord priority to increasing the participation rate of women within the Secretariat, and has laid down a target of an increase to 35 per cent by 1995, with a 25 per cent participation rate by women in posts at the D-1 level and above. As noted in document A/46/377, in order to meet this target, a substantial number of women will have to be recruited and promoted each year, particularly at higher levels.

Let me conclude by saying that it is clear that women must be viewed as an integral part of the entire United Nations system, if the intent and the word of the Charter which governs all our work is to be implemented in a just and honest way. The responsibility for promoting the equal participation by women in all efforts for international cooperation, peace, and disarmament thus rests on all our shoulders. The role of non-governmental organizations such as the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom continues to constitute a valuable contribution to those efforts.

(Mr. Morris, Australia)

Mr. President, finally and with your indulgence, I would like to take this opportunity in a rather different capacity, that of my chairmanship of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons Working Group on Verification, to make a brief announcement, if I could, and that is that the meeting scheduled for tomorrow morning will not now take place, although I would invite delegations to check their document boxes by early afternoon to receive the paper which will form the basis of our discussions on Monday's meeting.

Mr. NEAGU (Romania): May I welcome the presence at today's meeting of the Conference on Disarmament of the distinguished Minister for External Affairs of Zaire, His Excellency Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya? It is with particular pleasure that I would like to convey our congratulations to Ambassador Vicente Berasategui on his assumption of the post of Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations. As you have rightly observed, Sir, indeed Ambassador Berasategui needs no introduction. Everybody around this table and the Conference as a whole has greatly benefited from his competence, diligence and tact, especially since 1984 when he started his association with the Conference. We are sure that his expertise and advice will greatly help us in our deliberations in the fulfilment of the mandate of the Conference. May I wish him all the best, full success in his important post?

I wish to extend a warm welcome to the distinguished ladies assembled in Geneva to mark International Women's Day and present at today's meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

We would like to thank them for the important declaration adopted at their conference. International Women's Day is celebrated each year, on 8 March, all over the world as a recognition of the essential role of women in all fields of human endeavour.

We are aware of and appreciate the important activity women develop in non-governmental organizations for promoting peace and disarmament on our planet. We listened with great interest to the declaration read out at the Conference. The topic chosen this year - economic, social and cultural rights as a prerequisite to peace - is a particularly appropriate subject at a time when rapid and dramatic changes occur in Europe and in the ever more interdependent world. It is our responsibility at this Conference to negotiate disarmament agreements that will open the way to a safe and secure future, free from the menace of weapons of mass destruction. Arms control and disarmament have a bearing on peace and the well-being of the people of the world.

I can assure all ladies honouring our plenary session today and manifesting interest in the work of the Conference on Disarmament that we feel encouraged in our efforts by their presence here, that their message constitutes a new and fresh stimulus for our deliberations and that we shall do our best in order to achieve the objective of establishing inter-State relations not on military force but on cooperation. I would like to conclude by stressing how honoured I feel to wish our distinguished guests success in their work, social activity and family life.

Mr. HU (China) (translated from Chinese): First of all, the Chinese delegation would like to express its welcome to His Excellency the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zaire, Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, and His Excellency Ambassador Bruno Bottai, the Secretary-General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Italy, for their presence and their statements in our plenary. Like the previous speakers, the Chinese delegation also wishes to congratulate Ambassador Berasategui sincerely on his assumption of the post of Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament and assure him of its continuous and full cooperation.

International Women's Day is one of the major international festivals. On this day more than 500 million women in China join their sisters all over the world in celebrating this event. Today, on the eve of the festival, representatives of a number of international women's organizations have honoured our plenary with their presence. We would like to express our welcome to them and extend our congratulations to them and all other women present.

Arms control and disarmament is a major issue that has a bearing on the peace, security and development of the people of the world. Today, when the world situation is undergoing enormous changes, international disarmament efforts are faced with opportunities for major progress as well as numerous challenges. It goes without saying that our task in the field of disarmament becomes even more important and at the same time remains very difficult. It is therefore more imperative for the international community, including the community of women, to make joint efforts. Many international organizations and non-governmental organizations, including women's organizations, have made great contributions in this regard, and will play an even greater role in the future. The Chinese delegation would like to express its appreciation for their efforts and contributions.

Mrs. BAUTA (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): As this is a special occasion in the plenary of the Conference on Disarmament, it is an honour for the Cuban delegation, on behalf of the Group of 21, to take the floor this morning and welcome the presence in this room of the eminent persons who are with us this morning, from your country, Sir, the Minister whom we indeed know because of his outstanding performance in the work he was assigned as President of the Security Council. The same applies to the presence of the Minister and Under-Secretary from the Italian Foreign Ministry. Today is undoubtedly a very special day because we also have the particular pleasure of welcoming Ambassador Vicente Berasategui in his new position. We know he will carry out this new task with the skill he has always demonstrated in these duties.

Perhaps the Group of 21 has decided to follow a somewhat unusual procedure today in asking a woman representative of the delegations that make it up to take the floor on this occasion in order to have the pleasure of welcoming the presence in this room of the women who follow from a distance, but with no lack of effectiveness - far from it - the concerns that we all share to reach genuine multilateral solutions for the problem of disarmament as the only real guarantee that we will be able to bequeath to our children

(Mrs. Bauta, Cuba)

and to the generations that will follow a safer and therefore better world. The efforts which are close to the feelings of this distinguished group of ladies present in this room this morning are justified and are also broad-based in so far as they proceed from the best approach to the problems of disarmament, which are seen from an all-round viewpoint that also includes a concern for development. The entire Group of 21 extends its greetings to them on the celebration of International Women's Day next Sunday and our express wishes that they should pursue the effort that brings them here today. We are convinced that no effort can be successful unless the intelligence, love and perseverence that are characteristic of the women of the world are harnessed to it.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the representative of Cuba very much for her statement, which she also made on behalf of the Group of 21. I now give the floor to the representative of Argentina.

Mr. GROSSI (Argentina) (translated from Spanish): My delegation fully endorses and associates itself with the terms of the statement which the delegation of Cuba, on behalf of the Group of 21, has just made to welcome the presence here this morning of the ladies who are meeting under the auspices of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom on the occasion of International Women's Day. Their message and their presence among us are a stimulus for our work and a useful and timely reminder of our special responsibility before the international community. Like the delegations that spoke before me, I also wish to welcome the presence among us this morning of His Excellency the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zaire, His Excellency Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, and the Secretary-General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Italy, Ambassador Bruno Bottai. We are eagerly looking forward to their respective messages.

On this occasion I would like to say a few brief words on behalf of my delegation with regard to the formal installation of Ambassador Vicente Ernesto Berasategui as Secretary-General of this Conference on Disarmament. I will not repeat what has already been said concerning the professional and personal background of Ambassador Berasategui; it is well known to all. Allow me merely this morning to note the sincere satisfaction and legitimate pride at seeing a distinguished ambassador from the Argentine foreign service take on the important duty of guiding the work of this Conference in such an important year for our negotiating efforts. We are sure that he will continue and develop the outstanding tradition of Ambassadors Riki Jaipal and Miljan Komatina in the appropriate manner. Ambassador Berasategui, please accept these words of satisfaction and congratulations from your Government and those of this delegation, which not long ago you led with the same enthusiasm as you will now devote to your new and important duties.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): We can now move to the list of speakers for this morning. On the list are the representatives of Zaire, Italy and Belgium. It is with special pleasure that I invite the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zaire to deliver his statement.

Mr. BAGBENI (Zaire) (translated from French): It is a great privilege for me to take the floor on behalf of my country and my delegation in the Conference on Disarmament in its capacity as President of this important and unique negotiating forum in the field of disarmament. Following Yugoslavia as President of the February 1992 session of the Conference on Disarmament, I can appreciate the honour done to my country, Zaire, of presiding for a second time over the Conference on Disarmament, in view of the fact that I had the pleasure of so doing in June 1985 for the first time; presiding over this important session which is of great importance following the forty-sixth session of the United Nations General Assembly. I would like to pay a special tribute to His Excellency Ambassador Miljan Komatina, former Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament, for the skill he displayed during his term of office. I would also like to express my warmest congratulations to Ambassador Vicente Ernesto Berasategui, the new Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General, with whom I have had the honour of working for many years, both in Geneva and in New York; I have confidence in his intellectual and moral skills, and I have no doubt that he will successfully discharge his new functions. I would also like to welcome in this room the presence of the women who are participating in the conference on the subject of economic, social and cultural rights, and to say to them that their presence in our midst and the forthcoming celebration of International Women's Day next 8 March emphasize once again the dynamic role that women play throughout the world in promoting peace in the world.

It is well known that our world is undergoing deep and extensive changes both in the political and in the social spheres. Political innovations, new initiatives taken here and there, both regionally and internationally, the irreversible upsurge of democracy, the impetus for pluralism in opinions and ideas, the constant reminders of the relevant provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights that underlie these profound changes have made it indispensable today for all modern political societies to take into account all the parameters that form the basis of the world that is being forged before our eyes.

In this context, my country, Zaire, endorses the irreversible march that its people undertook starting on 24 April 1990 towards a complete and full process of pluralist democratization which will shortly give rise to the advent of a really democratic Third Republic. Whatever the vicissitudes encountered on this path of democratization, the present Government headed by His Excellency Mr. Nguz a Karl-i-Bond is determined to complete this process in order to give Zaire democratic institutions after a constitution has been drawn up and adopted by means of a referendum that will take place this year. This indicates how much the Zairian people as a whole is attached to this noble and democratic objective.

The new world which is being built is intended to be a world of peace and security which will be marked by enhanced international cooperation while safeguarding the sovereign equality of States but without the threat of the use of nuclear, conventional or chemical weapons or ideological confrontation.

(Mr. Bagbeni, Zaire)

This is undoubtedly the right place to express our full appreciation for the statement that the Russian President, Mr. Boris Yeltsin, made on 29 January last concerning the limitation and reduction of nuclear weapons. With these geopolitical upheavals which because of that very fact entail a sometimes harrowing review of military alliances and strategies, the inevitable conversion of certain military-industrial complexes is necessary. The world faces new prospects of the use of the scientific military potential and colossal financial resources that were devoted to weapons, for new tasks of economic development and social progress which should benefit mankind as a whole. The world is definitely no longer involved in a race to over-arm. And therefore we can better understand the relevance of the recommendations of the Conference devoted to disarmament and development. It seems clear to us that disarmament without economic progress in the countries of the third world, without a reduction of the gap that separates the countries of the North from those of the South, will only exacerbate bitterness and deepen the lack of understanding and disparities in the world. And we cannot try to promote the civilization of the Universe if such inequalities persist.

Zaire views positively the new era which is marked by these changes of all kinds. Yet it is necessary to express misgivings at the emergence of notions and ideas concerning a certain right of interference which certain former colonial Powers have been claiming with regard to their former colonized countries. The rules of international law enshrine the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of States and contain no provision, at present, for meddling and interference in the internal affairs of other States, small or large, of any nature whatever. Under resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960 proclaiming the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the aspirations of peoples alone enable them to decide on their own future and freely choose their political system. Yet while we encourage all these political changes, we must beware of believing with complacent optimism that democracy automatically opens our countries to economic progress and social and cultural development. Zaire considers that democracy constitutes a means and not an end in itself, which should enable the people to be constantly consulted and involved in all activities in the political and economic life of the nation. Its economic, social and cultural development will depend on the mobilization of its human, economic and financial resources, and especially on the creative genius which will be demonstrated by its people.

The present Conference on Disarmament has a very rich and very varied agenda. It enables each of our delegations to assess the progress made on each of the items on it in order to envisage more dynamic prospects regarding items on which real progress has been made as far as negotiation is concerned. To that end, my delegation considers that the multilateral convention on the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and their destruction, which was, moreover, the subject of the Paris Conference, from 7 to 11 January 1989, has been unanimously welcomed by the member States and that it would therefore be appropriate for this convention to enjoy accession by all the States members of the Conference on Disarmament so that an arsenal is finally removed from the list of weapons of mass destruction constituted by chemical weapons. To

(Mr. Bagbeni, Zaire)

that end my delegation wishes to congratulate all the chairmen of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons who have worked steadfastly to finalize the text of this convention on chemical weapons after the intensive negotiations and consultations they had to conduct for that purpose. The question of the conclusion of an international convention on chemical weapons which is on the agenda of this Conference is, without any doubt, one of the subjects that has focused the greatest attention of the international community in recent years. The Geneva Protocol of 1925 on chemical weapons signed under the auspices of the League of Nations raised complex questions, so much so that many countries did not hesitate to circumvent it, if not disregard it. That is why, following so much improper use of the relevant provisions of the Protocol, this question has been the subject of substantial discussions here in Geneva on many occasions in order to add to it and develop it.

Since the international conference on chemical weapons held in Paris, notable progress has been made in Geneva. So many obstacles have been removed, so many rewarding discussions have been held on chemical weapons, but what is important is that we must crown our efforts, because between now and the end of the year this convention will be concluded, and therefore signed by all the States parties - at least that is our hope.

I cannot but recognize that, with regard to nuclear disarmament, decisive progress has been made by the United States and the former USSR. Consequently, Zaire welcomes the emphasis that is currently being placed on the question of general and complete disarmament, and the forthcoming signature in Paris at the end of July 1992 of the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) by which the United States and the Russian Federation have undertaken to reduce their long-range intercontinental strategic weapons substantially further boosts the process of nuclear disarmament. This treaty, like the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-range and Shorter-range Missiles (the INF Treaty), constitutes the most striking proof that tangible progress can be made thanks to the political will of all the partners in the disarmament negotiations. Zaire hails and welcomes the conclusion of these two agreements as decisive steps along the path to nuclear and complete disarmament to which the international community aspires.

Allow me to welcome the initiative announced by President Bush, on 27 September 1991, as well as the positive reaction prompted by this initiative in Moscow. This is a step towards genuine disarmament reversing the arms race. I also hope that President Bush's forthcoming meeting with President Yeltsin will signpost the paths towards further enhanced nuclear disarmament. In this same context, Zaire welcomes with particular satisfaction the decision of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, announced on 17 October 1991, to remove another 700 warheads from the nuclear arsenal of the Western alliance in Europe and to destroy 50 per cent of the nuclear devices that are stockpiled there. To this list of decisions adopted by NATO we should add the signature of agreements dealing with conventional forces in Europe - the CFE Treaty - confidence-building and security-building - Vienna document 1990 - and the joint declaration by NATO and the Warsaw Pact that put an end to the cold war once and for all. I think it is important to emphasize

(Mr. Bagbeni, Zaire)

that in the world of conventional weapons and forces, the Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe can be considered as the most complex regional agreement on arms control.

With regard to the prevention of the use of nuclear weapons in the event of armed conflict between States, I would like to note with satisfaction that following the end of the cold war and ideological rivalry between the countries of Eastern Europe and those of the West, the risk of such a conflagration has considerably diminished. But the danger remains among the other countries that have acquired nuclear technologies. It was feared during the Gulf war that the Iraqis might use nuclear weapons in order to resolve the Middle East conflict, that the use of such weapons might constitute a means of political blackmail that would have enabled them, after the aggression perpetrated against Kuwait, to keep what they had acquired. This means that nowadays the danger of a nuclear war does not lie solely within the initiative of the nuclear Powers but also other countries possessing nuclear weapons or the scientific potential to produce them. And in this context, the conduct of certain industrialized countries that cooperate with developing countries in the field of nuclear weapons is to be condemned, especially when we remember that this type of cooperation does not always take place in the absence of a quest for profit, and when all those involved know that weapons of mass destruction are involved. The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons is the treaty that has served as an international instrument to prevent this type of cooperation. And here we welcome as positive gestures the intentions expressed by France, China and Pakistan to accede to this Treaty. And I would also like to express my country's satisfaction at seeing South Africa accede to it. My country nevertheless would like to echo the concern expressed recently by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Germany concerning the need to provide the NPT with sanctions which would be imposed on any State party breaching the provisions of the Treaty. Zaire subscribes to the idea of sanctions that should be adopted by the Security Council, as the organ that is entrusted with international peace and security against any State that fails to respect the provisions of the Treaty.

We know that the atom has opened up unlimited prospects for the health sciences, agriculture, and so on, and that as long as nuclear science is used for peaceful purposes to alleviate human suffering or to improve crops, mankind can only benefit, but to use nuclear weapons for purposes of destruction will always be an insane act and therefore to be condemned. Consequently, I would like accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons by many countries to make this international legal instrument the mandatory route which will restore tranquillity, peace and sound cooperation among States in the area of nuclear science. In this context I would like to congratulate the authorities of Brazil and Argentina following the agreement that the two countries have just signed in Guadalajara on the exclusively peaceful use of nuclear energy.

Allow me in conclusion to dwell a little on resolution 46/36 L which deals with transparency in international transfers of conventional weapons. It has seemed to us that this resolution is incomplete for two fundamental reasons which relate to universality and non-discrimination. As has been

(Mr. Bagbeni, Zaire)

rightly pointed out by some delegations, arms transfers should necessarily include transfers from producers to users and sites of stockpiles. With regard to the proposed register, a few procedures remain to be followed for it to make a real contribution to disarmament. Further work on our part will no doubt be decisive in this matter.

I would like to wish the Conference on Disarmament every success and to hope that in the near future it will reach positive conclusions.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zaire very much for his important statement. I now give the floor to the representative of Italy, His Excellency the Secretary-General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ambassador Bruno Bottai.

Mr. BOTTAI (Italy): A period of two years has elapsed since my previous visit, and it gives me great pleasure to again have the honour of addressing the Conference on Disarmament. I first of all congratulate you on your appointment to the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament, which, during the course of the year, should achieve substantial new targets: I am certain that this session's proceedings will benefit greatly from your skilful leadership. It is for me today an additional pleasure and honour to have the opportunity to address this Conference on the occasion of the participation in our proceedings of His Excellency Mr. Bagbeni Nzengeya, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Zaire. Allow me also to address a special greeting to the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom and to all the women they represent here, whose international day we shall shortly be celebrating. Their efforts and commitment for the cause of international peace and security are an integral part of the endeavours to achieve general and complete disarmament.

My presence here is inspired by the interest with which Italy views your activity within the framework of a body representing the only multilateral forum capable of exerting its activity in various fields of primary importance for disarmament as a whole. The strategic and ideological confrontation between East and West is now over and more homogeneous processes in the internal organization of States in Europe are under way, disclosing new perspectives for disarmament. In such a favourable environment, Italy has endeavoured to encourage wider forms of conventional arms limitations in Europe and has rapidly completed its own process of ratification of the CFE Treaty; has extended its own activity in the field of the prevention of the proliferation of all types of weapons, with the introduction of rigorous legislation on the arms trade; has endorsed the principle of "full-scope safeguards" in nuclear exports.

Even established international institutions are undergoing a process of transformation to adapt themselves to the new realities. At its summit held in Rome last November, the Atlantic Alliance formalized a process of deep restructuring of its functions and strategy, thus opening the way to a new era of cooperation with the former potential adversaries of central and eastern Europe, and with the new States that have emerged from the dissolution of the Soviet Union. CSCE, greater in size and, as we strongly hope, with an

(Mr. Bottai, Italy)

increased capacity for internal mediation in a framework of tolerance and the rule of law, is now striving towards an appropriate institutionalization of its own structures aimed at establishing a security system of a cooperative type among its members, where any resort to force for the settlement of disputes that is unfortunately not only potential in character, could be definitely discarded.

However, in spite of such a promising general political climate, it would be misleading to neglect the risks of tensions and instability still existing in various forms in different regional contexts, including Europe, as a result of re-emerging strong nationalistic forces alongside the deteriorating economic conditions typical of transitional phases. As a consequence, the most industrialized countries are becoming increasingly conscious of their growing responsibilities in offering support when situations of great need and distress occur, in the awareness that a minimum of collective well-being is the prerequisite for attaining real progress in peace and democracy. The problem of a drastic reduction in expenditure in sectors that have been absorbing great shares of financial resources arises with greater emphasis, to meet such efforts of solidarity and ever-growing needs.

Italy has always been convinced of the necessity to drastically reduce nuclear arsenals well beyond the limitations spelled out in the START Treaty, and considers therefore that the initiatives and proposals of President Bush about further radical reductions in strategic nuclear armaments, as well as the most recent proposals by President Yeltsin, represent steps in the right direction, reshaping in thoroughly modified terms the equation of collective security, the strategic balance and disarmament. Alongside such moves, as far as Europe is concerned, there is also the foreseen elimination of all ground-based nuclear tactical weapons as well as the strong progress registered in the process of conventional disarmament.

In addition to such encouraging improvements, the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty itself has lately gained greater momentum as the basic instrument for the prevention of proliferation. After the positive review in the positions of those countries that had long felt reservations with regard to the Treaty or its safeguards regime, such as France and China among the nuclear Powers, together with various other non-nuclear countries, there are growing expectations that those remaining countries which still hesitate to join the NPT regime might also in the near future review their positions. They would otherwise risk isolation in the context of a non-proliferation regime now accepted by the great majority of countries, which Italy strongly hopes will acquire indefinite duration at the next review conference in 1995. Moreover, initiatives of great interest and positive impact have already occurred in a regional context; I am thinking, first and foremost, of Argentina and Brazil.

We ask ourselves at this stage whether we are not already witnessing the first moves towards a post-nuclear era, given the fading role of the once dominant nuclear arsenals in international strategic relationships, as we perceived it for over 40 years. The surviving threat seems to be today more connected with certain risks of proliferation and tensions in some regional

(Mr. Bottai, Italy)

frameworks or with the possibility of errors or miscalculations, rather than actual escalation into a global conflict. It thus seems unavoidable that questions like the prohibition of nuclear testing, to which the CD has for a long time devoted its attention without being able to remove all the persisting reservations, will need to be addressed with a renewed sense of urgency so as to keep pace with the great progress already recorded or anticipated in the field of nuclear arms reductions. Italy, having long shared the view that the elimination of nuclear testing cannot be dissociated from the problem of the size of existing arsenals, is therefore of the view that conditions are now ripe to pursue, from a technical as well as from a political perspective, the objective of a total ban on nuclear testing, through reliable means of verification. Please allow me to note that such an objective would meet widely shared expectations in public opinion and political circles in my country.

For the first time in the history of the negotiations for the prohibition of chemical weapons, our goal finally seems to be within reach. The negotiations have proved to be much lengthier than at first expected, as a result of the difficulties in reconciling the innovative solutions gradually emerging with the diverging views between East and West as to the degree of transparency necessary to foster mutual confidence. As the history of these negotiations largely reflected, for better or for worse, the wider political circumstances of the time, they should reflect today the recent and extraordinary changes in world events. A new dimension of the role of the international community is taking shape, as particularly highlighted during the dramatic sequence of events after Kuwait's invasion by Iraq. (War always brings about a tremendous toll of suffering, and it was wise of you, Mr. President, to recall that in your opening statement on your appointment to the presidency of the CD.)

Only a limited number of weeks are left before the deadline we have set ourselves elapses; the General Assembly of the United Nations itself, at its last session, decided as a matter of the highest priority that the chemical weapons convention should be concluded before the end of the year. Should it not be possible for the Conference on Disarmament to meet this goal in time for its presentation at the next United Nations General Assembly, we are concerned that the whole project would risk postponement to a further round of negotiations of unpredictable length, with a negative impact on multilateral disarmament as a whole. We strongly believe, however, that it is possible to reach a conclusion in the negotiations and that this outcome will give new impetus to the future activity of the CD. I won't hide from you that most of the differences still existing do not seem of an unsurmountable nature to a layman not so directly involved like myself.

With great expectation we are following the extraordinary efforts you are deploying this year, at the level of delegations as well as in the context of the groupings, and we wholeheartedly support the endeavours of the German Chairman to reach compromises on the essential issues still unresolved as quickly as possible. At the same time other problems of a more technical nature could be dealt with later by the preparatory commission, with the assistance of the provisional technical secretariat.

(Mr. Bottai, Italy)

Allow me to briefly elaborate on some of these essential issues still pending. First of all, on the problem of verification which for years has been a stumbling-block to progress in various fields of disarmament. Italy considers that the convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons will be an unprecedented achievement in multilateral disarmament, in that it proposes a new set of verification measures not applicable solely to a given sector, whose management has been entrusted to a neutral and impartial organization. In the establishment of a genuine superpartes system lies the best possible guarantee that any bilateral aspect, which is usually involved when a country has doubts about compliance by someone else, will be adequately taken into account, while at the same time discouraging the inappropriate exercise of the right to trigger a challenge inspection. It seems to us that the team of inspectors, drawing on its autonomous powers of neutral evaluation, will be in the best position to assess, on site, whether the suspicion prompting the request justifies the prosecution or the interruption of the inspection; and to estimate the degree of intrusiveness required, without prejudice to the basic needs for the protection of confidentiality.

Those in Europe who have already opened up their national borders to intrusive bilateral inspections of military activities cannot but recognize the importance of the "supernational" nature of the convention, as an anticipation of a new era characterized by the increasing role of the international community in the consolidation of peace and security. Along the same line of thinking, Italy does not believe that its own continuous presence within the executive council would be essential for the protection of its national interests, provided the structure and functioning of the council reflects such a "new way of thinking" - looking ahead beyond the year 2000 and not backwards - and on the condition that the relevance of a country's chemical industry is given due consideration.

Furthermore, the convention will introduce new forms of collective solidarity, as in the case of assistance and protection against use or threat of use, as well as the concern to safeguard the economic and technological development of member States and international cooperation in the field of chemical activities not prohibited by the ban. Italy is also prepared to examine possible forms of cooperation to facilitate the burdensome tasks of destruction required by the convention.

The fact that important sectors of chemical industry, including those parts considered as "relevant" located also in our country, will be affected by the implementation of the convention, should not be taken lightly. We are aware of the concerns felt by industry about attaining a realistic balance between management of available resources and satisfactory deterrence without being overburdened with declarations and inspections. For this reason we are in favour of a pragmatic approach in order to leave a certain margin of discretion to the future organization and to ensure that the convention will be able, after its initial phase of application, to adapt itself to changing circumstances. In view of this, Italy is in favour of adopting an amendment procedure which, whilst naturally safeguarding the essential features of the ban, does not confine the convention within excessively rigid boundaries.

(Mr. Bottai, Italy)

Italy is ready, with an open mind, for the final effort aimed at shaping the real identity of the convention which, although comprising the fruit of differing perceptions of security, will also encompass several essential common points at the heart of the CW ban. In order not to be born outdated, the convention will have to reflect a minimal relinquishment of national sovereignty for the sake of collectively shared interests. It would be extremely disappointing, after so many years of negotiations, if the convention were to be signed by only a group of like-minded States: this is certainly not what all of us had in mind - nor, I believe, France, in its welcome offer to host a conference in Paris before the end of the year for the signature of the convention, with universality as one of its essential targets.

I should like to conclude by expressing Italy's complete confidence in the future role of the Conference on Disarmament. As in the past, it will have to adapt itself to new challenges even in its very structure without binding itself to any predetermined "magic" numbers for its composition, beyond which the realm of effectiveness would be lost. Important countries, both within and outside Europe, are awaiting the opportunity to make their positive contribution as full members of the CD. The revision of the competences of the CD will also have to be addressed as soon as possible after the conclusion of the negotiations on the CW ban. In the meantime, this body is already at grips with a new item related to the subject of transparency in armaments. I should like to confirm that it is Italy's sincere expectation that the consideration of this issue will be started without further delay, following the specific request formulated by the United Nations General Assembly. As a follow-on to the seminar held in Florence in 1990, a new opportunity for addressing the problem of arms transfers in an informal framework will be offered by Italy in the same town early next autumn, under the auspices of the Department for Disarmament Affairs of the United Nations, in order to examine the issue in a regional perspective. Arms transfers constitute only the first of a number of interrelated and interdependent problems, which could be seen by the CD, to the benefit of everyone, in a comprehensive and balanced way, such as conversion, non-proliferation, production, promotion of technological cooperation and the interrelationship between disarmament on a regional and on a global scale.

I wish to conclude by recalling the statement made in this chamber by Ambassador Komatina, when bidding farewell after years of clever and committed activity for the cause of disarmament: "If, as we expect, disarmament becomes a common endeavour and a norm in present-day life through ongoing negotiations, the role of the Conference will be strengthened." In endorsing such a hope, I would like to take the opportunity to express to our new Secretary-General, Ambassador Berasategui, from a country, Argentina, of ancient and fraternal ties with Italy, the most sincere congratulations on his appointment and confident good wishes for success in the fulfilment of his important responsibilities.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the Secretary-General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Italy for his important statement he has just made and his kind words addressed to myself. I now give the floor to the representative of Belgium, Ambassador Servais.

Mr. SERVAIS (Belgium) (translated from French): As I am addressing this body for the first time since your election, Mr. President, I should like to congratulate you wholeheartedly on taking up the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament and wish you definite success in the discharge of your important duties. Your experience and wisdom will undoubtedly help to advance the Conference's work, and I should like to assure you, here, of the entire support of my delegation in your burdensome task. I also take this opportunity to welcome the presence among us of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of your country, Mr. Bagbeni, whose statement we listened to very carefully. I also welcome the presence among us of His Excellency Ambassador Bruno Bottai, Secretary-General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Italy, a country that we all love and admire both for its prestigeous past and for the outstanding role it plays on the international scene in general, and more specifically in disarmament matters. May I also be permitted to associate myself fully with the expressions of respect and appreciation we have heard on the occasion of International Women's Day? Their interest and their support for our efforts to promote disarmament offer valuable encouragement to all of us. Like the preceding speakers, I wish to congratulate Ambassador Berasategui on the occasion of his appointment to the post of Secretary-General of our Conference and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Having distributed barrowloads of compliments, I now come to the substance of my message. At a time when, under your enlightened leadership, the negotiations aimed at achieving a chemical weapons ban are entering a phase which we all hope will be decisive, I should like to spell out the position of my authorities on a particular point related to the choice of headquarters of the future organization. My authorities consider that The Hague offers incontrovertible advantages which many of us were able to see for ourselves last summer. There is no need to praise the traditions of hospitality or organization of our Dutch friends, and for that reason, while it fully appreciates the good points that other countries might offer, Belgium has chosen to give its firm support to the candidature of the Netherlands.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the representative of Belgium for his statement and his kind words. I give the floor to the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, Ambassador von Wagner.

Mr. von WAGNER (Germany): I have asked for the floor just to make some administrative announcements due to some changes in meetings which are scheduled either in the tentative timetable of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons or in the programme of the Conference. As Mr. Morris has already announced, his meeting tomorrow will be cancelled. The same is true for the meeting which is scheduled for this afternoon on open-ended consultations on article IX. It will not be held. On the other hand, on behalf of Ambassador Tóth, I may announce that he wishes to hold private

(Mr. von Wagner, Germany)

consultations tomorrow morning after 10 a.m. in Room I beside this Conference Room, and since the meeting of the Group of 21 was scheduled for Room I tomorrow, I may announce on behalf of Ambassador Calovski that this meeting scheduled in Room I will be held in Room V. I repeat, the meeting of the Group of 21 on outer space will be held not in Room I but in Room V.

Mr. RANJBAR (Islamic Republic of Iran): My Ambassador was supposed to make a statement today on behalf of the Group of 21, but unfortunately, due to circumstances beyond his control, at the last minute he found himself unable to do so. Although somewhat late, I wish, however, to make the following statement for the record.

First of all, I would like to welcome His Excellency the Minister for External Affairs of Zaire, Mr. Nzengeya, and His Excellency the Secretary-General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Italy, Ambassador Bottai, to our meeting this morning. Secondly, on behalf of the Group of 21, I would like to congratulate Ambassador Berasategui on his assumption of the post of Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations. We are confident that, with his recognized diplomatic skill, he will be able to guide the Conference in the most efficient way. His Excellency Ambassador Berasategui takes up his new responsibilities at a time when a bright prospect has opened to the Conference. In the light of the new situation in international relations, the Conference on Disarmament can play a significant role towards the creation of a more secure world. Under his able guidance the Conference will achieve this goal.

Let me also join the previous speakers in welcoming the women participating in the eighth congress commemorating International Women's Day. Normally, it is assumed that matters related to armaments are handled by men, whereas it is quite clear that women also encourage the cause of disarmament for peace. We hope that next year, when they come to visit us, we will have been able to conclude the chemical weapons convention.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I would now like to turn to the timetable of meetings to be held by the Conference and its subsidiary bodies next week. The secretariat has had an informal paper distributed containing a timetable which, as usual, is merely indicative and subject to change if necessary. I would like to emphasize that under this timetable, immediately after the meeting on Thursday, 12 March, the Conference will hold an initial meeting on item 2, entitled "Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament". On that understanding, I suggest we adopt the informal paper.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): As we have reached the end of the agenda, I shall adjourn the meeting. The next plenary meeting of the Conference will take place on Thursday, 12 March, at 10 a.m.

The meeting rose at 11.50 a.m.

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.616
12 March 1992

ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE SIX HUNDRED AND SIXTEENTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 12 March 1992, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. Mutuale Kikanke (Zaire)

GE.92-60626/3389H

The PRESIDENT: I declare open the 616th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

I would like to recall that today, immediately following the plenary meeting, the Conference will hold an informal meeting on the substance of agenda item 2, entitled "Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament". I would like to inform you that on the list of speakers for today are the representatives of Mexico, Cuba and China. I give the floor to the representative of Mexico, Ambassador Marín Bosch.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): Mr. President, you have been guiding our work with diplomatic skill and tact. For various reasons, this Conference is at a difficult stage and we nurture the hope that during your term the organizational questions that are still awaiting agreement will be solved. We would like to place on record our appreciation for the way in which Ambassador Naste Calovski and his delegation conducted the work of the CD at the beginning of this first part of the 1992 session. My Government wishes to express its deepest gratitude to Ambassador Miljan Komatina for his valuable professional and human contribution towards lightening our responsibilities. We thank the United Nations Secretary-General for appointing our good friend Ambassador Vicente Berasategui as his Personal Representative and Secretary-General of this Conference. His experience will be of benefit to us all and we offer him the full cooperation of our delegation.

1992 is a year of anniversaries. It is the quincentenary of the meeting of two worlds, America and Europe. It is also the twentieth anniversary of the Convention on biological weapons and of the first agreements between the United States and the Soviet Union on strategic arms limitation (SALT I). And a month ago, on 14 February, several events were held in Mexico City to mark the twenty-fifth anniversary of the signing of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco). And on that occasion President Carlos Salinas de Gortari stated, inter alia:

> "This historic document, which played a pioneering role in the struggle for disarmament, was a demonstration of what can be achieved through dialogue and cooperation for civilized coexistence among nations.
>
> "In this way the Treaty of Tlatelolco constituted a major step forward in the long search for general and complete disarmament to which peoples aspire.
>
> "In the struggle for disarmament we in Mexico recognize our national interest. Our geography and the force of our history lead us to maintain an attachment to the law and respect for a value which is fundamental - the sovereignty of the nation."

(Mr. Marín Bosch, Mexico)

For his part, my country's Minister for Foreign Affairs stated:

> "Mexico will continue to champion approaches to international security based on an order which offers greater fairness and fewer weapons. The quest for a world free from weapons of mass destruction, beginning with nuclear weapons, must be part of the future world order ... A regime of non-proliferation, genuine and universal, is more necessary today than ever before."

Thirty years ago, on 14 March 1962, the inaugural meeting of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (ENDC) was held in this Council Chamber. On that day the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Omar Loutfi, stated:

> "The role of the United Nations in the developments leading up to the establishment of the Disarmament Committee and to the convening of the present Conference demonstrates once again the determination of the international community that every possible effort be made to end the intensifying armaments race. The Members of the United Nations, in exercising their responsibilities under the Charter in the field of disarmament, have recognized the usefulness of direct talks between the major Powers as well as the practical contributions which may be made by the less powerful nations and, in fact, by all Members of the Organization. The recent General Assembly resolutions"

- declared Mr. Loutfi in 1962 -

> "related to disarmament would seem to indicate that the Members of the United Nations intend to persist in this field until the world's deep and growing concern has been transmuted into concrete achievements."

For three decades the members of ENDC did "persist in this field" to bring about disarmament and thus curb "the world's growing concern". At the beginning there were 18 nations (although in point of fact there were 17, because France refused to participate as long as the unusual institution of the Soviet-United States co-chairmanship was maintained). The partial nuclear-test-ban Treaty and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons were concluded. Then, with the initial formula of political and military balance in mind, the membership of the Conference was expanded.

In the 1970s, a Convention on biological weapons and the ENMOD Convention were drawn up. In 1978, following the special General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the Conference was again enlarged. With 40 members, including China and France, the CD became the "single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum". But, 14 years after its reincarnation, the CD has still not managed to conclude a single multilateral disarmament agreement. It is true that much progress has been made in the drafting of a convention for the complete elimination of chemical weapons but, unfortunately, we still do not have an agreed text.

(Mr. Marín Bosch, Mexico)

In recent years we have managed to "transmute the world's growing concern for disarmament", at least with regard to the relations between the two main military Powers. And this is important. But it has certainly not been as a consequence of the efforts made at this Conference. Since 1978, when it was baptized the "sole negotiating organ", the CD has not been notable for its "concrete achievements". Instead, it is forces and changes outside the CD that have managed to transmute the world's concern for disarmament.

In the library on disarmament, here in the United Nations, and in the offices of our respective permanent missions, there are dozens of voluminous tomes which contain a plethora of working papers and mountains of words which have been uttered in this room since 1962. We have left behind the bipolar world of 1962. Yet it should be remembered that in that year of 1962, in the midst of the cold war, we were able to lay down the priorities that have guided our work for three decades: nuclear disarmament and general and complete disarmament under effective international control. For my delegation, these priorities are still valid and we consider that today more than ever we must devise concrete measures for nuclear disarmament with a view to the total elimination of these weapons of mass destruction. Today more than ever before it is indispensable to prepare a comprehensive programme of disarmament that will serve as a guide in examining and solving in an orderly fashion the varied and complex range of problems in this area. Every day we are told emphatically that a new world has dawned, a world based on rules that are now universally acceptable. Everywhere we see important changes in the political and economic spheres. Major nuclear disarmament measures are announced and efforts are made, not without enormous difficulties, to dismantle the military apparatus and weapons factories. Armies and military budgets are being cut. But here, in the Council Chamber, we continue with our rituals of the past. As on previous occasions, we have started our 1992 session with a repetition of discussions which are somewhat futile. Moreover, this year there has been a fight because of the proposal that a new item should be added to the agenda, whose inclusion, for very understandable reasons, has been resisted by those who uphold - or think they are upholding - the priorities of our work programme.

Nevertheless, the Conference on Disarmament is still drifting. And it will be hard to find a new path if we remain tied to an obsolete pattern of work. Every day it is more difficult to justify our existence in a changing world. The Conference should not waste its time on palliatives. We cannot agree, as we did in 1976 when the ENMOD Convention was "negotiated", to start work with the sole purpose of "producing something". Nobody denies the importance of the negotiations on the chemical weapons convention, in the Ad Hoc Committee which is being led with dedication and enthusiasm by Ambassador von Wagner. We are not referring to that item on the agenda, but to the way in which we tackle the other questions. In some institutions the pupils or inmates are given some pointless tasks just to pass the time, to keep them occupied ("busywork" in English). Something like this is happening in the CD.

(Mr. Marin Bosch, Mexico)

Let us decide where we want to go and explore how we will define this new course. We could, as my delegation suggested at the inaugural meeting on 21 January last, exchange ideas in an informal way so as to air many of the questions which are hampering or complicating our work and which at present can only be dealt with in the President's consultations on Wednesdays, in the slow process of talks in and between the various groups or, still worse, in the lengthy mechanism of bilateral contacts. Perhaps we could ask the Secretary-General of the Conference to convene periodic meetings of heads of delegation to discuss, without papers, without records and without interpreters, those questions pertaining to our work which are considered to be of general interest.

To sum up and conclude: the present structure of the Conference no longer has any point and it is becoming an obstacle for making progress on agreed ideas. Our methods of work are counter-productive and we cannot continue to maintain this fiction of having three groups (plus China) without prejudicing the future of the CD. Thirty years on from its creation and 14 from its renaissance the Conference should, in its next incarnation, better reflect the structure of the world and have, amongst its members, those countries that have something to contribute to its deliberations and those that, because of their military might or political situation, it would be absurd to leave out.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the representative of Mexico for his statement and for his kind words addressed to the Chair. I give the floor to the representative of Cuba, Mrs. Bauta Solés.

Mrs. BAUTA SOLES (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): I will deliver my statement this morning in English, for reasons which will become apparent immediately.

(continued in English)

The delegations of Algeria, Brazil, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Iran, Kenya, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Sri Lanka, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Zaire have asked me to make the following statement.

The forty-sixth General Assembly of the United Nations adopted resolution 46/38 B by 123 votes in favour.

A majority of the international community therefore clearly favours the continuation and conclusion of the work on the comprehensive programme of disarmament. The resolution recommends the conclusion of the work on the CPD which embraces issues which recently have been the subject of many important international gatherings. These include the role of the United Nations and the continuing relevance of its Charter; the efforts to ensure peace, stability and cooperation; the commitment to collective security; peace-keeping efforts; nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation in all its aspects regarding weapons of mass destruction, to name but a few of those

(Mrs. Bauta Solés, Cuba)

brought to the attention of the international community in the final statement of the Security Council summit held in New York on 31 January 1992 and which have already been examined in depth in the multilateral negotiations that have been devoted throughout the years to a CPD.

For this reason, among others, the significance that the large majority of countries attribute to the comprehensive programme of disarmament should not be mistakenly interpreted as the inertia of yesterday's priorities, but rather as the harbinger of a viable and practical way to approach the issues of today.

This basic reasoning behind resolution 46/38 B is that "a comprehensive programme of disarmament would provide an appropriate framework for the various multilateral, bilateral and unilateral initiatives and proposals put forward recently", and adds: "Considering that the present international situation is conducive to a renewed effort towards the conclusion of the comprehensive programme of disarmament".

The 1989 final report of the Conference on Disarmament to the General Assembly of that same year regarding CPD states that: "The Ad Hoc Committee also agreed that it shall resume work with a view to resolving the outstanding issues in the near future, when circumstances are more conducive to making progress in this regard".

We are everywhere reminded that the international climate has changed and is perhaps more conducive to greater multilateral understanding and cooperation. And yet the Conference on Disarmament is not able to implement resolution 46/38 B which calls for the re-establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee on the comprehensive programme of disarmament and the solution of the outstanding issues and conclusion of those negotiations.

The delegations which I mentioned at the beginning are convinced that a comprehensive programme of disarmament will be beneficial to all States as we seek to establish an agreed framework for future multilateral disarmament negotiations.

Mr. HU (China) (translated from Chinese): Just now the distinguished representative of Cuba, Mrs. Magda Bauta Solés, made a statement on behalf of the delegations of 20 States proposing that the Ad Hoc Committee on the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament should be re-established. On behalf of the Chinese delegation I would like to express our support for this proposal.

The Chinese delegation has all along attached importance to agenda item 8 of the CD, "Comprehensive programme of disarmament". Under the guidance of the distinguished late Ambassador of Mexico, His Excellency Mr. Robles, and with the joint efforts of various delegations, some progress had been made on this item. Later, due to reasons well known to all, the work of the Ad Hoc Committee was interrupted. In the view of the Chinese delegation, in the present circumstances it is appropriate to resume work on the formulation

(Mr. Hu, China)

of the comprehensive programme of disarmament and to re-establish the Ad Hoc Committee in accordance with General Assembly resolution 46/38 B, so as to build on the texts already agreed to, with a view to resolving the outstanding issues.

Mr. SHANNON (Canada): I have two brief announcements to make. First, in my statement to this Conference last week I introduced a number of documents. Since then my delegation has received the latest edition of the compendium of statements and working papers on outer space, produced by the Arms Control and Disarmament Division of my Government. This edition, which covers the 1991 session of the CD and the Ad Hoc Committee, has been assigned the number CD/1142 and will be distributed to delegations shortly. I hope that delegations will continue to find the compendium a useful reference tool and that it will contribute to our work on this important subject.

My second point concerns the site of the headquarters of the chemical weapons convention. I am pleased to be authorized to announce today that Canada supports the Netherlands offer to provide the site for the CWC headquarters.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): Are there any delegations wishing to take the floor at this stage? There are not. I should now like to make a brief closing statement because this is the last plenary meeting under the presidency of Zaire.

The last four weeks of the work of the Conference have been conducted on the basis of decisions that had already been taken by the presidency during the informal consultations which preceded the opening of the annual session, as well as under the presidency of my distinguished predecessor, Ambassador Calovski. My efforts focused on the implementation of those decisions, particularly the organizational issues that were still in abeyance. We finally proceeded to the designation of the chairmen of the ad hoc committees on the prevention of an arms race in space, effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of such weapons, and on radiological weapons. The Committee on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Space has already begun its work and I hope that the other ad hoc committees will follow in the days to come. Consultations were also continued on the request addressed to us by the General Assembly in its resolution 46/36 L, entitled "Transparency in armaments". Open-ended consultations provided us with a starting-point to progress in the work on this issue. A consensus emerged on the designation of a special coordinator for all the aspects relating to the question, including the organizational aspects and the substantive aspects on this subject. Consultations on the designation of a special coordinator are to continue. But I consider that we have also achieved some progress on certain organizational and substantive issues which are part of the General Assembly's request. As of today we are beginning a series of informal meetings on the substance of items 2 and 3 of the agenda, which I am sure will be very useful in our future work.

(The President)

Because we are on the eve of the thirtieth anniversary of the Conference, we should be aware of the urgency and importance of achieving progress in our consultations and our work and, in particular, we hope that we will be able to complete the work on a multilateral treaty concerning chemical weapons. The Conference has been encouraged to intensify its deliberations by the visits from distinguished figures who have presented the views of their Governments. We specially noted the presence of the Vice-Chancellor of Germany, His Excellency the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Genscher. I had already had an opportunity to say how honoured we were by his presence, but also by his cooperation, not only because he is Vice-Chancellor but also because his country and his delegation have made a particularly noteworthy contribution in the work of our Conference. I am also referring to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zaire, Mr. Raphael Ahuntu, the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Poland, Mr. Andrzej Kurkiewicz, and the Secretary-General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Italy, Ambassador Bruno Bottai. I personally greatly appreciated the contributions they made and I think that I am reflecting the sentiments of the Conference in saying that all of us together express our gratitude to them here.

I would like to say that above and beyond our differences in area of origin and in our respective views and differences in history, our Conference continues to be the crucible where a universal awareness can be moulded and should be moulded of one of the greatest values of the human family - I have in mind the right to security. Yesterday, today, tomorrow and the day after tomorrow, this is a right that belongs to each and every one; no nation can or could appropriate it for its exclusive use. At a time when the tempest of democracy, the hurricane of rights and freedoms are sweeping the world, across Siberia and in the palms of the tropics, it is here, through our work, that we are participating in the construction and erection of one of the principal pillars of the edifice of peace in international relations. May we in so doing earn the gratitude of our children and our future generations. The lanterns of the millenium are going out and everywhere we are presented with signs of the twilight of one period and the bells are tolling the knell of our millenium, but at the same time announcing the dawn of a new era. On the occasion of the thirtieth anniversary of the Conference, we are called upon to move slowly and surely to promote the climate of mutual trust. I remember a quotation from Napoleon Bonaparte who said somewhere that every day of lost time is a chance of future misfortune. Bearing in mind the creative and innovative imagination of the human spirit in the field of new weapons, I could paraphrase this by saying that every year of lost time is a chance of future misfortune. This means that it is not fitting to hesitate to grant one another all the measures that have the potential to initiate, prompt and stimulate trust among us. Among these measures and by way of simple example, I might mention transparency. This is a word which, like any new concept, is laden at once with hope and fear, the fear of falling victim to bluff, the fear of being tricked. Yet, this word is a key word of the new times. It is one of those words that are symbols of tomorrow and of the new order among nations. But - and we must also be aware of this - it is also one of those

(The President)

I thank each and every one of you for your contributions. I also thank you for the honour that you have bestowed upon my country, Zaire, and you are aware how much I appreciate that honour because the chance to sit in the President's chair does not come every year. I take this opportunity to thank our Secretary-General for his very valuable contribution. I will not forget the special coordinators and the chairmen of the ad hoc committees, as well as the entire administrative service and the interpreters. I conclude by wishing my successor, Ambassador Semichi of Algeria, success in his duties. Those were the few thoughts in the form of a closing statement on the part of the President.

The secretariat has distributed today, at the request of the President, the timetable of meetings to be held by the Conference and its subsidiary bodies next week. As usual, the timetable is purely indicative and subject to change as necessary. Allow me to emphasize that the first meeting on item 3 of the agenda, entitled "Prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters", will be held on Thursday, 19 March, immediately following the plenary meeting of the Conference. If there are no objections I will be able to take it that the Conference adopts this timetable.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): There are no other matters to consider today. With your permission I will now adjourn the plenary meeting. However, before doing so, I should like to remind you once again that in accordance with the timetable for this week, the Conference will hold an informal meeting on agenda item 2 in five minutes' time. The next plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament will take place on Thursday, 19 March, at 10 a.m. sharp.

The meeting rose at 10.55 a.m.